# The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CX, No. 2 February, 1944

## CONTENTS

The Chinese Catholic Culture Movement ... *Bishop Paul Yu-pin* 81
The Concept of Sacred Liturgy ... *William J. Lallou* 90
The Appeal to the Emotions in Preaching—Part I
*Edmond Darvil Benard* 95
The Presentation and Purification ... *Raymond F. Stoll* 103
Purple and Violet ... *Walter Greene* 112
The Spiritual Care of Religious ... *William F. Allen* 119
The Extension of Christ's Mystical Body ... *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 124
Recent Dogmatic Theology ... *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 131
Recent Scripture Study ... *Francis X. Peirce, S.J.* 138

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Flour for Altar Breads ... 145
Bombing of Civilians ... 146
A Problem in Sterilization ... 147
The Physician's Professional Secret ... 147

*Contents Continued on Next Page*

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington (17), D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington (17) D. C.

Published monthly by The Board of Trustees of The American Ecclesiastical Review, from Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves., Baltimore, Md. Subscription price: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, January 10, 1944, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Copyright 1944, by The American Ecclesiastical Review

*Contents continued from previous page*

Blessing the Deacon at Pontifical Mass ..... 148
Monsignori in Mufti ..... 148

ANALECTA

Vernacular Translations of the Sacred Scriptures ..... 150
Recognition of Authentic Miracles ..... 151
The Cause of the Blessed Philippine Duchesne ..... 151

BOOK REVIEWS

The Captain Wears a Cross, *by Chaplain Maguire* ..... 152
Theologia Naturalis, *by Rafael Martinez del Campo, S.J.* ..... 152
From Jesus to Paul, *by Joseph Klausner* ..... 154
The Leonard Feeney Omnibus ..... 154
God's Guests of Tomorrow, *by L. M. Dooley, S.V.D.* ..... 155
Discovering Mexico, *by John A. O'Brien* ..... 156
Democracy, Should It Survive? ..... 156
BOOK NOTES ..... 158
BOOKS RECEIVED ..... 160

**For the Sacristy and the Sanctuary**

***Manual of***

**Forty Hours' Adoration**

THIS Manual Contains LITANIAE ET PRECES: the Approved Music for "Te Deum" and "Tantum Ergo," and everything requisite for the Devotion—Ceremonies, Rubrics and Prayers.

Order copies now, so that they will be on hand when needed, as they are sure to be.

**Twenty-five cents per copy:**
**Five copies, one dollar**

**The American Ecclesiastical Review**
**Catholic University of America**
**Washington 17, D. C.**

***When the Bishop comes, it is well to have at hand the***

**Manual of**

**Episcopal Visitation and Sacrament of Confirmation**

Full and detailed information, both for the ceremony of Confirmation and for the Bishop's official visit. All the canonical prescriptions minutely explained. Indispensable for the occasion.

**Twenty-five cents per copy**
**Five copies, one dollar**

**American Ecclesiastical Review**
**Catholic University of America**
**Washington 17, D. C.**

## THE CHINESE CATHOLIC CULTURE MOVEMENT

The Chinese are "a people of an ancient culture." In point of fact, Chinese culture is the oldest living culture in the world—old when Greece and Rome were still young. Indeed its very antiquity offers a strong presumption that there is much of value to be found in it, for only the good and true can stand the ravages of time. An ignoble and corrupt culture would not have satisfied the longings of a people for so many centuries. The antiquity of Chinese culture stamps it as worthwhile.

What is this ancient culture which has known periods of greatness and splendor, and to which a great future is assured? It is her agriculture, her social structure, her music, her art, her philosophy, her literature, in a word all that China has achieved in the fifty centuries of her history. In the limits of this paper we can not begin to treat such a culture adequately. However, we shall offer a few ideas of its content.

It may seem strange to speak of China's economic achievements, particularly in the light of the last fifty years of her history. One might immediately object, and the objection would have to be admitted, that China was far behind the other nations of the world in industrial advancement. However, we must not limit ourselves to modern times. It would not be fair to any nation to judge its accomplishments on fifty years of a fifty century history. If we take the story of China as a whole, we find that from her earliest days she was interested in economic theory and practice. Unlike her neighbors in India, whose philosophy taught them to despise the needs of the body, China has always made her corporal well-being a part of her philosophy. Confucius was only one among many who taught that civilization depended on the masses being clothed and fed. Agriculture, the foundation of the nation, received every encouragement. The Emperor himself would descend from his throne to perform the ritual plowing to give good example to his people. Under Wang Mang and Wang Anshih, systems of government economic control were evolved that bore many of the marks of modern state socialism. In general, however, business and agriculture were in the hands of the people,—yet not with that lack of restraint that characterizes the *laissez faire* system. Custom, secret societies, and guilds so regulated business that China was preserved from the rugged individualism to which by nature her

people were so much inclined. In the course of many centuries we must admit that the economic organization of China supplied her people with the means of livelihood. Indeed with the exception of the last few centuries she maintained a standard of living that equalled anything in Europe up to the 16th century. Only within the past two hundred years has Europe forged ahead of China, and this through her many inventions of the industrial age. Earlier, Marco Polo, after visiting the most famous cities of Europe, was amazed at the civilization and prosperity he found in the cities of China. China, therefore, can point with satisfaction to her economic achievement in providing reasonably well throughout so many centuries for the most numerous people in the world.

In the field of political science the Chinese have a record we may well be proud of. With a nation larger than Europe, with a population more numerous than that of Europe, with difficulties of travel and communication, China achieved political unity under the Ch'in regime over 200 years before Christ. For 2000 years the form of government has remained the same. Emperors have been deposed, new dynasties set up, but the essential elements of this pre-Christian system have sufficed to bring the Chinese people through all their struggles as one nation and one culture. Only the British Empire has rivalled China in the number of people subject to her rule. When Britain has maintained her rule for 2000 years, then we will begin to appreciate the greatness of China's accomplishment. Nor need we be blinded to the worth of this feat by the past thirty years of her history. Even this period of transition from a monarchy to a republic, carried out while fighting an aggressor nation, will be a glorious one for China and pay tribute to her powers of quick recovery and stability.

However, it is not surprising that the Chinese have been able to maintain a satisfactory government through all these centuries. Political science seems to have been our chief preoccupation from our earliest days. The theme of many of our classical writings is the formation of a social system that will contribute to the well-being of man. Beginning with the family, the natural unit that we understand so well, with all its loyalties and duties, we conceived the whole nation as one large family and the emperor as the father. Confucius would write that "all within the four seas were brothers," and his thought might bear completion, that the emperor was the father of all. Hence China's government, though monarchical was also patriarchal. The emperor ruled only so long as he had the mandate of heaven, and this

mandate was manifest in the contentment of the people. For as the philosopher Mengtse wrote around 300 B.C., "The people are the most important element in the country." And the Book of History records: "The wisdom of heaven is reflected by the wisdom of the people and the reward or punishment of heaven is based upon the judgment of the people." Hence when the people were unhappy, when evil times stalked the land, this was a sign that heaven no longer favored the emperor, that the mandate of heaven had been taken from his hands, and that instead of being the "son of heaven," he now stood alone and could be deposed.

Actually the fundamental reason for the success of the Chinese potitical system has been its emphasis on morality. Confucius taught that human society could prosper only when men observed the right relations. His teachings were incorporated in the Chinese classics and these were made the basis of civil service examinations for government positions. The result was that the learned and the moral ruled the country. A study of Chinese documents reveals the interesting fact that rulers and their officials seldom threatened their subjects. Their commands are more often exhortations to do right because it is virtuous, relying on the moral sense of the people to stimulate them to action. Physical violence or military force was looked down upon, so that the military caste was never held in honor. This esteem for scholars and disregard for the military accounts in a measure for China's total unpreparedness against foreign aggression.

Though China's government was monarchical in form, in spirit and reality it was democratic. The Chinese seem to be by nature democratic. Probably no people has been less affected by their rulers. The Emperor sat on his throne, issued exhortations, and collected taxes, while the people went about their own business and governed themselves through their local county organizations. The unit of strength in China has never been the nation or national loyalty, but the family and its loyalties. Chinese government has always been a government by men, not by law. When the men were good, all went well. When the men were evil, they were usually deposed.

Essentially a democracy in spirit long before America was discovered, it remained for the year 1911 to usher in the form of democracy. This form of democracy, China sought in America. Lincoln had spoken of a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." Sun Yat-sen, the founder of the Chinese Republic, would incorporate these same principles in his democratic system, seeking a government

of the people through his principle of nationalism. His understanding of this principle meant a China unshackled by foreign commitments and without any prejudices of race. A government by the people could only mean democracy—the rule by the people. But Sun Yat-sen realized that though the Chinese were a democratic people, yet they were not prepared for formal democracy on a national scale. Hence with the wisdom of the true pedagogue, he planned to nurture the people along until they were capable of taking over the government, bringing them through a period of military control, while all lawless and resisting elements were subdued, then through a period of tutorship, in which they would be trained to the forms of democracy, and finally to the constitutional period of full democracy. It is significant that Chiang Kai-shek has promised that the Constitutional period will begin one year after the close of the war.

When we come to appraise China's art, we find ourselves faced with quite contrary opinions, some of devastating condemnation, others of lavish praise. For some, Chinese art offends every artistic canon; for others, it embodies a beauty found only in the Orient. The truth is probably in the golden mean. Not all that China has produced is artistic, but she has had periods of artistic glory. This is not to say that Europeans will appreciate all that Chinese find beautiful. The art of a nation is drawn from its soil, lives in its atmosphere, is limited by its climate, materials, history and institutions. A nation's art, while participating in the universal canons of beauty, has also its own particular emphasis. Thus there will inevitably be periods and styles of art, so surely as there are peoples of different ages and places. And China is no exception. Her art is neither monotonous nor uniform. Her painting, which to so many westerners is incomprehensible, does find a noble response in the Chinese. We know that the Jesuit lay-brother Castiglione, painting for the Chinese Emperor, had to change some of his most beautiful paintings in European style to make them appreciated by the Chinese. For the Chinese have never aimed at a photographic representation of nature, nor even a realistic reproduction of models. The impression of the artist is always uppermost in the portrayal of scenes. Chinese philosophy also adds its bit to art. Man is usually subordinated to nature, for much of Chinese philosophy consists in the harmonizing of man with nature.

In her poetry she has sought beauty in aptness of expression and the music of her tones. It is useless for a European to condemn Chinese poetry for its want of imagination or its paucity of themes. He has

only to watch a Chinese reciting it, to see him relishing the cadences and finding a satisfaction in its unexpressed thoughts, to know that one must be of the people to understand.

Architecture in China shows how truly a culture belongs to a nation. It seems to give form and substance to the spirit of her philosophy and religion. The ancestral hall, the focal point for the ceremonies of family reverence, finds its parallel in all the larger edifices. Her temples are so built with their courts opening one upon the other that at every step you are given new surprises until finally you come to the great hall of the presiding deity. Because most of China's buildings were constructed of wood, few of them remain from the earlier dynasties. But the palaces, temples, and other edifices that survive are monuments to a highly developed artistic sense. What is remarkable particularly is the delicacy of sentiment and taste with which they have harmonized the construction of their sanctuaries with the surrounding country. Never does a Chinese monastery clash with its environment. It seems to grow out of the land. In adapting their architecture to the natural beauty of a countryside, the Chinese have been surpassed by no other people. The style of their buildings differs radically from that of the West. In your Gothic style the vertical lines predominate with tall spires reaching to heaven. Chinese architecture, on the contrary, emphasized the horizontal lines, giving to the soul a sentiment of peace and repose.

No account of the culture of China, no matter how sketchy, would be complete without reference to ceramics. "Chinaware" has become a commonplace in your language. Skill in fashioning pottery has belonged to the Chinese for many centuries. One has only to see the shapely and delicately made vases of the Sung and Ming dynasties to realize the cultural attainments of the people.

Probably one of the chief characteristics of China's culture is her respect for learning. Nowhere has the Scholar been more highly esteemed, and nowhere has such an enormous literature grown up over the centuries. It seems safe to say that in the year 1700 or even 1800, China had more written and printed pages in her libraries than in all the countries of the world combined. Almost every class of writing was provided; history, literature, poetry, encyclopedias, philosophy, biography, and geography, while each religion produced its own voluminous literature. Scholarship was the test for government positions. As early as a century before Christ, a form of civil service examination was introduced which led to the formation of the educated class, the

Litterati, who dominated Chinese life throughout its entire history. Education was open to all without distinction. Poor boys were often sponsored by their villages and rose to high position in the government. The educational content was chiefly the classics. These provided a fine moral training, but because of their narrow scope, left China weak in the field of science.

The social structure of the Chinese Empire was intimately linked with her family system. The family was the pivotal point for all of Chinese life and the source of China's stability. Of the five relations on which a good government was built, three were found within the circle of the home, namely, the relation between husband and wife, father and son, and older brother and younger brother. It was within the home that the rites were performed to insure the happiness of departed parents. It was to guarantee the continuance of these rites that a male offspring was so eagerly desired. The same filial regard regulated marriage customs, and gave to this institution its importance. Children were betrothed by parents through intermediaries. The marriages that resulted from these betrothals were more often successful than not. This was due in great part to the training of the girl for her position as wife and mother and also to the solicitude of the parents to procure for their son or daughter a good companion. Family loyalty was stressed in the moral training of the children, and was proposed as one of the chief motives for good conduct. Indeed China policed herself through this sense of family loyalty, making the whole family responsible for the misdeeds of their members. We read in the book of Exodus of a promise attached to the fourth Commandment of honor thy father and thy mother, "that thou mayest be long-lived upon the land which the Lord thy God will give thee." The Chinese insistance on filial piety may well be the answer to the long history of our people.

It is customary to consider as the three religions of China, Confucianism, Buddhism and Taoism. Of the three, Confucianism and Taoism took their rise in China, while Buddhism was imported from India. Confucianism, or more properly, the sect of the Litterati, is actually not a religion, nor was it founded as one. Confucius in the works which contain his teachings has little to say about our relations with a supreme being. He does provide for the sacrifice to heaven by the Emperor once a year and stresses the necessity of reverencing the ancestors. Yet his doctrine is essentially a way of life—good ethics—that can well serve as the basis for religion. With the passage of time many religious elements were introduced into the sect but in its origin

and in most of its practice it remained a way of life. The cult of Confucius was not paid to a god, but to one whom scholars venerated as their teacher and to whose writings they owed all their success. Perhaps this conception of Confucianism will explain why Chinese can be Confucianists while yet professing one of the other two religions of Buddhism and Taoism.

Buddhism on the other hand is truly a religion, with its god or many gods, its sacrifices, prayers for the dead, heaven and hell. Brought into China around the time of Christ, it reached its zenith in the 8th century. Its influence, however, on China's art and life has extended even to our present day. It has been aptly called a path of escape—escape from the sorrow and impermanence of this present life. It found ready acceptance by the Chinese because it filled a need that Confucianism left void. It clarified their relations with a supreme being and offered them a means of solacing their dead through elaborate ritual and prayers. It tried to raise its adherents above the world of sorrow, by proving to them that the world was only illusion. Once freed from this illusion, the sorrow would vanish.

Taoism, one of China's earliest religions, began not as a religion but as a philosophy. Its first proponent Laotsu lived about the time of Confucius, some five hundred years before Christ, and outlined a philosophy of nature. Life for him was merely letting oneself go—trying to live in accord with nature—allowing the natural in one to express itself. His mystic communing with the principle of the universe rises at times to exalted heights. However, his philosophy was made to substantiate a very low form of idolatry and superstition organized some two centuries after Christ. The religion of Taoism was occupied with the search for immortality and claimed to obtain it through physical exercises, methods of breathing, and by means of a certain pill of immortality. It is full of magic and superstition.

In general the Chinese have shown a rather eclectic spirit in their religions. They seem to have considered and distinguished a social and an individual aspect. Socially they thought their obligations satisfied by attending any of the temples or belonging to any of the religions at hand. Their personal need for religion was satisfied in their family, where they paid their respects to their ancestors, cultivated the morality of Confucianism, and with various superstitions warded off the evil spirits. But the important fact behind all this, is that they were always religious and with a remarkably pure morality.

With this short and necessarily inadequate view of Chinese culture,

I think we will arrive at the same conclusion as our Holy Father and be ready to agree that China has had "an ancient culture and one that has had periods of splendor and greatness." What has been and will be the attitude of the Church towards this culture? It will endeavor to conserve all that is best in it, for this is dearest to the people. It will elevate and enrich it, for no matter how glorious it may have been, it is still human. It cries for completion. It can be and must be supernaturalized. And where ignorance or weakness of men has allowed error and evil to creep in and mar this culture, the Church will come to teach and purify. It is the culture's best friend, destroying in it only what would bring it to ruin.

The Church, as the Catholic conceives it, is not foreign to Chinese culture. Theologians, reasoning from the will of God to save all men, teach that His grace is active in every man. They know that God is continually drawing every soul towards Himself. Hence the goal toward which every human culture tends and by a divine attraction, is the possession of the good, the true, and the beautiful; and this goal can be realized fully only within the Catholic Church. What Chinese culture seeks, the Church offers. Truly she can say with St. Paul: "What you worship without knowing it, that I preach to you." The Church, therefore, does not come to destroy, but to fulfill. She knows that she has but to fulfill her mission—to be "a light of revelation to the Gentiles"—to let the light of her principles fall on Chinese culture, and the Chinese will be the first to recognize the goal towards which they have been striving. And this is the purpose of the Chinese Catholic Cultural Association.

Formed some two years ago in China, it greets China as she enters a cultural renaissance. Composed of zealous and enlightened Catholics, this association would "baptize" Chinese culture, would try to make the Church feel "at home" in it. These associates endeavor to make Chinese culture Catholic, not in the sense of supplanting a Chinese culture by a Catholic European culture, but as we have already explained, in animating Chinese culture with Catholic principles. These associates know that China is passing through a critical period in her history—that she is becoming conscious of her nationhood—that she can never be occidental. They wish therefore to separate the Church from the cultural elements that are proper to the European cultures and to plant her in their own cultural elements. They wish the Church to be the soul and inspiration of a renascent Chinese culture—to live her life in them and to manifest that life through their Chinese culture.

The fulfillment of that aim is manifested in the works they under-

take: the translation of books that show how Catholicity has inspired European and American culture; the composition of original works along the same lines; the establishment of research bureaus occupied with the investigation of Chinese culture from a Catholic viewpoint; bringing to the Catholics of all nations a knowledge of the noteworthy features of Chinese culture; the revision and re-editing of Catholic literary works. Many of these were written in the early days of Christianity's entrance into China. They need only be brought to the notice of the people; the formation of bureaus that would arrange lectures by both Catholic and non-Catholic scholars; co-operation with various Catholic cultural organizations in promoting Catholic culture; co-operation with non-Catholic groups in striving to build up our Chinese national culture; the collection of works both ancient and modern that have bearing on our Catholic culture; the exchange of publications with organizations of other countries; the establishment of chairs of scholastic philosophy in National Universities; the founding of scholarships for needy students; prizes for outstanding accomplishments; arranging for the exchange of professors and students with Catholic Universities of America and Europe; the furthering of all the social works of the Church.

The scope of activity of this organization gives only a small idea of the role it is destined to play in the cultural renaissance of China. Already the movement has begun and with brilliant promise. Under the inspiration of the Catholic University of Peiping, a new era in architecture has dawned. Churches and schools have begun to rise, embodying all the beauty of the old Chinese architecture. In the realm of art, Luke Cheng has given to the Catholic world a new religious painting. The sacred images of our Catholic tradition are cast in a Chinese background with Chinese motives and the result is beautiful and devotional. In some parts of China priests are experimenting with Chinese music, trying to put it to the service of God. Everywhere this new spirit is apparent. Under the Chinese Catholic Cultural Association it is hoped that this movement will sweep through every phase of Chinese culture. Only then will the Church have become "at home" in China. Only then will Chinese have become "at home" in the Church. Only then will we have realized the ideal proposed by the Church—a Catholic religion in a Chinese culture, or in other words, the birth, development and perfection of a Chinese Catholic Culture.

*Washington, D. C.*

✠ PAUL YU-PIN
*Vicar Apostolic of Nanking.*

## THE CONCEPT OF SACRED LITURGY

It is only within comparatively recent times that the word, liturgy, especially in its adjectival form, has attained wide circulation among the faithful. It is generally used, however, with a connotation neither accurate with respect to its meaning nor complimentary with respect to its significance. So a liturgical altar, in popular estimation, is one which departs in the *nth* degree from the style of altar to which we have been long accustomed. Liturgical music has come to be considered as describing compositions distinguished by their monotony and lack of melody. The liturgical movement in the Church means to many something "to be viewed with alarm" as an attempt to break down the distinction between sanctuary and nave in a revolutionary movement to convert the congregation, largely against their will, into so many altar-boys and altar-girls. In view of the unfortunate, inaccurate application of the adjective, liturgical, to prominent features of the public worship of the Church, it seems pertinent to study the exact significance of the word, liturgy, as applied to our official cult of God.

To begin with the word itself, liturgy is of course derived from the Greek. Under the word, λειτουργία, in a standard Greek dictionary, we find the following definition: "a public service, discharged by an individual at his own expense." Thus, a citizen became a λειτουργὸς by financing soldiers for the army or providing a ship for the navy. He also acted in the same capacity when he provided funds for the public games. As these games had a religious significance, being held in honor of Zeus at Olympia and in honor of Apollo at Delphi, the word came to have a ritual significance and so it is used in New Testament Greek. When Zachary is described in the Gospel (Luke 1:23) as finishing the days of his priestly office, in the Greek text it is the proper oblique case of the word λειτουργία which is used. Similarly, St. Paul (Heb. 8:2) describes our Lord as the great worshipper of the New Law and the Greek text employs the word, λειτουργὸς.

In patristic writings, the Greek or Latin original of our English term, liturgy, is used exclusively as referring to the ceremonial ritual of the Church. In the East, from the earliest Christian times down to the present, the word has been the technical expression for the act of worship *par excellence*, which we call the Mass in the Roman Liturgy. Thus, in the Byzantine Church, whether Catholic or Orthodox, the

equivalent of the Mass is spoken of as the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, the Liturgy of St. Basil. In the West, especially from the time of the Renaissance, liturgy has come to mean the study of the rites and ceremonies of the official worship of the Church and so the word is to be interpreted in the curricula of our Seminaries and Universities.

The individual may give outward expression to his appreciation of the fundamental relationships existing between his Creator and himself but this expression is not liturgy. It will vary with the particular disposition of the individual and so it will be effusive or restrained, extravagant or dignified, hysterical or rational. Or men may associate together with their fellows to pay a communal tribute of adoration, thanksgiving, repentance, and petition to God but such external worship is not yet liturgy. To be liturgy, the external cult of God must not only be public but it must be official. Not the chance, or even the deliberate, association of man with his fellow men for the purpose of religious worship constitutes that worship liturgical. To be liturgy, an act of public worship must be officially ordered and regulated by the Church. Hence, the generally accepted definition of liturgy is: the public, external worship of God as commanded and regulated by the Church.

There are many popular devotions, sanctioned by the Church, to some extent even regulated by her, which are not liturgical, in the accurate use of that term, because the Church does not command them as exercises of her official cult and they are not to be found in her service books. For example, the devotion of the Three Hours, which crowds our churches on Good Friday, must be classed as a popular devotion not as a liturgical observance because there is no prescription requiring the holding of the *Tre Ore* on Good Friday. The prescribed liturgy of the day is the service, concluding with the Mass of the Pre-Sanctified, as found in the Roman Missal. Similarly, the Holy Hour of Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, which justly has so strong an appeal for the faithful, is not a liturgical function, because, though encouraged by the Church and to be conducted according to the legislation governing the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, there is no law requiring the Holy Hour as part of the official worship of the Church. Even Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament is a *praeter*-liturgical function, since, though the established protocol regulating the cult of the Holy Eucharist must be observed in conducting it, we look in vain in Missal or Ritual for the rite of Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, except as incidental to the liturgical procession ordered

to be held on Corpus Christi. Even so highly-favored and well-beloved an exercise of public devotion as is the Way of the Cross, richly indulgenced by the Church, is still not part of her liturgy. We could imagine a Catholic church without Stations of the Cross, though it would be an oddity, but we could not imagine one without an altar. The former furnishing provides for a popular devotion while the latter is needed for the supreme act of the liturgy, the celebration of Mass. To be liturgy, therefore, a function must not only be public and popular and approved, or even promoted, by the Church; it must be a part of her official worship, an obligatory observance, found in her official service books, the Missal or the Breviary, the Ritual or the Pontifical.

In conducting exercises of public devotion, certain norms must be observed, but this conformity with liturgical legislation does not include the exercises in question in the liturgy of the Church. Moreover, we find among the blessings in the Ritual those used to sanctify objects to be employed in popular devotions. The blessings, therefore, are liturgical but the functions in which they are to be used are not therefore liturgical, any more than the Ritual blessing for instruments concerned in mountain climbing makes Alpinism a liturgical function. There is, for instance, an official blessing for banners to be carried in procession but the use of such a blessed banner does not make the procession in which it is borne an act of sacred liturgy. The blessing of various cords and scapulars is liturgical but the wearing of such blessed articles is nowhere prescribed and hence it is an act of private, or, at times, public, devotion but not a liturgical observance whereas the wearing of sacerdotal vestments is liturgical, for not only does the Ritual provide a blessing for them but their use is *de rigueur* by the rubrics of the Missal and Ritual and Pontifical. The rite for the erection of the Stations of the Cross is liturgy, carefully detailed in the Appendix to the Ritual. The exercise of the *Via Crucis* itself is not liturgy and we find in the Ritual no ceremonial to be observed the conduct of such devotion, except so far as it is vaguely indicated as incidental to the blessing and erection of the Stations of the Cross. The Ritual contains a form for the blessing of the ostensorium. There are repeated decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, regulating the details of the exposition and Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. The *Codex Juris* (Canon 1274) legislates concerning the days on which Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament may be given. Yet the rite of Benediction itself, so much a part of our public worship, cannot be

called liturgical, in the strict definition of the word, because no official service-book, Missal or Ritual or Pontifical, has any rite to be observed in giving Benediction or any prescription requiring it as a function of Catholic cult, except incidentally in the regulations of the Ritual governing the procession of the Blessed Sacrament on the Feast of Corpus Christi and in the directions for private Benediction after the Communion of the sick in their own homes and before replacing the Blessed Sacrament in the tabernacle after it has been carried to the sick.

To be liturgy, therefore, a function must belong to the official worship, prescribed by the Church and found in her liturgical books. The adjective, liturgical, to return to the theme of our first paragraph, means belonging to this authoritative cult, prescribed by the Church. A liturgical altar, consequently, need represent no radical departure from the style of altar familiar from long experience. It may be provided with *retablo* or dossal, or lack either of these. It may be covered with *baldachino* or lack such protection. All that is required is that its construction conform to the rubrics of the Missal (*Rubricae Generales*, XX), the canons of the *Codex Juris* (Canons 1197 ss.), and the decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites concerning altars. Liturgical music is that which is the proper accompaniment of the services of the liturgy. It may be Gregorian, polyphonic, or modern, so long as it is in accord with the *Motu Proprio* of Pius X on the subject of Church music. Similarly, the liturgical movement, rightly understood, implies no leftist propaganda in divine worship, but a campaign of education of the laity in the understanding of liturgy and such active participation in the Mass and other liturgical services as is consonant with existing rubrics and present-day legislation regulating the performance of the functions of the liturgy.

The distinction between liturgy and non-liturgy is naturally a technical one. It implies no disparagement of devotions, outside the strictly official worship of the Church, devotions dear to priests and people, many of which have already acquired the patina of centuries of use. But there is a special *cachet* which distinguishes liturgical functions. The ceremonial and the forms of prayer involved in them represent the authoritative voice of the Church in the matter of public worship. Many of them date from Apostolic or Patristic times and all were old when Columbus sailed westward across the Atlantic. So we have the Missal, governing the celebration of Mass in accordance with the divine mandate, "do this in commemoration of me." We

have the Breviary, the master prayer-book, whose psalms and hymns and orations are to be preferred to all other forms of prayer, because they express the service of praise which the Church, *ex officio*, in union with the God-Man, her Head, renders daily to the Almighty. Finally, there are the Ritual and the Pontifical, with the rites for the administration of the Sacraments and the application of the Sacramentals, the divinely instituted and ecclesiastically developed means of sanctification of the faithful. Liturgy, therefore, as contained in the official service-books of the Church, is to be more highly esteemed than are extra-liturgical devotions, however salutary and however much a part of our public worship. In liturgy, the Church directs our cult of God because of her authority derived from our Lord Himself, acting in conjunction with her Divine Head, the great worshipper, the high priest *par excellence*, "the minister of the holies" (τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργὸς). (Heb. 8:2.)

*Washington, D. C.* WILLIAM J. LALLOU

# THE APPEAL TO THE EMOTIONS IN PREACHING

## PART ONE

Of all the aspects of the art of public speaking in general, and of preaching in particular, the appeal to the emotions has been perhaps the most subject to misunderstanding, disagreement and confusion. Modern manuals of eloquence, while universally in accord with regard to the necessity of appealing to the emotions of an audience or congregation, all too often leave the reader comparatively in the dark as to how it may be done.

Every Catholic priest, from the very fact of his calling, is or should be a student of the art of preaching. The appeal to the emotions is a vital element of that art.

The object of all oratory, sacred or otherwise, is to persuade. The Catholic priest in the pulpit, speaking as the anointed minister of God, must, of course, instruct his people. He must bring them to a knowledge of God; he must teach them their obligations as God's creatures, their dignity and privileges as members of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ; he must explain to them the duties of their religion. But ultimately, if the essential purpose of his preaching is to be attained, he must persuade them of the fundamental, awful necessity of knowing, loving and serving God, and of saving their souls by the proper use of the means provided through Christ and His Church.

To say that a priest must persuade his hearers is the equivalent of saying that he must lead them to form a decision. And it is quite beyond question that a major element in the formation of a decision is, almost invariably, the emotional one. It follows that, although the purpose of preaching is not to excite emotion for its own sake, a sound and skilful use of the appeal to the emotions is not a mere optional embellishment of the sermon, but a most important factor in the accomplishment of its aim.

The present paper, together with two others scheduled to appear later in *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, will attempt to establish a practical set of principles governing the appeal to the emotions in preaching. This series is a tentative study, of course; but it is at least an effort, however inadequate, at a philosophical approach to what is in the last analysis a philosophical problem.

Any attempt to influence the emotions must be grounded in some

theory of what an emotion is. Practical rules for the guidance of the preacher in appealing to the emotions of his hearers must have a basis in psychology; and that psychology, in turn, must have a genuine foundation in the nature of man.

This article is submitted for the consideration of Catholic priests, who are in a fortunate position when it comes to the study of the art of preaching. Through their Aristotelico-Thomistic philosophical training, they are in possession of a habit of thought and an organic body of principles whose fundamental simplicity and universal potentialities provide an ideal framework in which to organize the specialized knowledge required in a particular field of human endeavor.

We do not contend, obviously, that the complete tenets of sacred eloquence are to be found in Thomistic philosophy. Preaching is an art by itself. But it works with human nature; and the complete and integrated view of human nature contained in Thomistic philosophy furnishes the preacher with a sound and adequate philosophical background for the exercise of his art. Moreover, the foundation provided by Thomism is not limited to broad generalities. To a degree surprising to one who regards philosophy as something too esoteric to be useful, Thomistic rational psychology provides a background of detail which is of striking and proximate utility to the preacher of the word of God.[1]

The first section of this article is devoted to an examination of the Thomistic theory of the nature of emotion. We hope that the reader will bear with us for these next few pages, which are of necessity rather abstract and a trifle involved. They are the necessary fundament for an understanding of the practical conclusions which follow.

## THE THOMISTIC THEORY OF EMOTION

"Emotion" is not a Thomistic term. What we mean by the "emotions" are treated by St. Thomas under the title *passiones animae.* In general, *passio* can mean any *reception.* Thus, in its broadest sense, the term *passio* can be applied even to intellection, which is, from one point of view, the reception in the mind of a concept or idea. *Passio* in its proper sense, however, always denotes the *recep-*

[1] We might mention, incidentally, that while St. Thomas has no specific treatise on sacred eloquence as such, there are to be found in his works many striking and profound comments on the dignity of, and the qualifications necessary for, the preacher. Cf. for example *Sum. Theol.*, III, q. 41, a. 3, ad 1m; *In Rom.* III, lect. 2; and *In Evan. Joan.* XII, lect. 4.

*tion of a thing or quality which entails, in its reception, the loss of something else.*[2]

This idea of reception and loss as connected with an emotional state may be expressed more in detail by saying that an emotion is the result, in us, of our being "acted upon" by some agent outside of ourselves. (This is the sense in which we *receive* something from it.) Corollary to this reception, we are somehow *changed*,—that is, we lose something, for every change is at once a loss and a gain. To be acted upon by some agent and to suffer a change in the process is of the essence of emotion.

The next step in an attempt to understand the nature of emotion is to consider in which of the human faculties it is primarily situated. The two great divisions of faculties are, of course, the "cognitive" faculties, by which we *know* things, and the "appetitive" faculties, by which we *desire*, or are *attracted to* things.

We have seen that in an emotion we *receive* something from, (or, in other words, we are acted upon by) some agent. A thing *acts* (upon another) as it exists in reality "in itself". Since a faculty, when it is acted upon in the strict sense, is necessarily acted upon by something outside of itself, it would seem logical that emotion is to be situated properly in that class of faculties which is concerned with objects as they exist in themselves in the real, external order of things. This eliminates from consideration the cognitive faculties, both the intellect and the faculties of sense cognition, because they are not immediately concerned with the individual external object as it exists in itself, but with the "concept" (idea) or "sense representation" of a thing as it exists *in the cognitive faculty*. It remains, then, that the emotions must be situated in the *appetitive* faculties, those faculties by which a human being desires something,—that is, by which he is attracted to some object as it exists in itself, outside of the person desiring it.[3] Thus, for example, I desire an orange, as it exists, outside of me, in the external order of things.

When we have once placed the emotions in their proper division of faculties, we are provided with a further explicitation of what is meant by saying that an emotion denotes the *reception* of something, because the action proper to the external thing which is the object of an appetitive faculty is the *attraction to itself* of the desiring subject.

Granting that emotion is proper to an appetitive faculty, in which

[2] Cf. *Sum. Theol.*, I–II, q. 22, a. 1, 2; also *De Veritate*, q. 26, a. 3.

[3] Cf. *Sum. Theol.*, I–II, q. 22, a. 2.

appetitive faculty is it to be placed? In the intellectual appetite, or *will*, which desires an object as known by the intellect? Or in the sense appetite, which tends towards an object as it is known through the impression it makes upon our senses?

The answer to this question is clear in the light of the fact that there is, in an emotional state, some sort of change in the person experiencing it. A change in the strict sense demands the acquisition of a new quality, or "form", as the Scholastics put it, and the loss of some other quality, the contrary "form". But the will, as an intellectual faculty, is immaterial; hence, when it "receives" a new form, it does so in an immaterial fashion which does not demand the concomitant deprivation of another form. St. Thomas points out that the "loss" of some thing, which is the necessary accompaniment of emotion, is a material, *corporeal* change. This fact points to a corporeal or "organic" faculty as the seat of emotion.[4] The only corporeal or organic faculty of appetition in the human composite is the *sense appetite*. Properly speaking, then, emotion is connected with the sense appetite of man; and an emotion, with the accompanying—and essential—bodily changes, is present when the sense appetite is attracted to some external thing.[5]

The fact that emotion is bound up with the movement of the sense appetite has important consequences. While in itself the sense appetite, like every appetite, is blind, it can only tend toward something which is, somehow, *known*. And because an appetite is a tendency towards something which is known as a good thing (that is, as capable of perfecting the subject in some manner), or, which follows as a necessary consequence, away from something known as a bad thing, it follows that an emotion must be the result of something perceived as good or bad. Thus we have the traditional Scholastic notion of emotion, insisting on the psychic as well as the physiological aspect.

This idea,—that the object which arouses an emotion must be known as good or bad, introduces us to a further aspect of the Scholastic theory of emotion.

Treating of the sense appetite in animals, St. Thomas remarks that it is, of its very nature, moved by what he calls the *vis aestimativa*.

[4] Cf. *Sum. Theol.*, I–II, q. 22, a. 3; also *De Veritate*, q. 26, a. 1.

[5] Cf. Richard R. Baker, *The Thomistic Theory of the Passions and their Influence upon the Will*, Notre Dame, Indiana, 1941, pp. 82–83, note 72, for an interesting supplementary explanation of the necessity of a physical transmutation in the emotional state.

This *vis aestimativa* is the internal sense faculty by which an animal is made aware, not of the appearances of an object to the external sense faculties of the subject, but of the *utility* or *harmfulness* of that object to the animal. According to the classic example, a sheep does not flee from a wolf because of the wolf's color or shape, but because he senses, through the *vis aestimativa*, that the wolf would be, for him, a lethal playmate.[6]

Corresponding to the *vis aestimativa* of the beast, there is in man an internal sense faculty called the *vis cogitativa*.[7] It performs the same function of perceiving utility or harmfulness, but it is not by any means the entirely and basely material faculty that the *vis aestimativa* is. Man is endowed with an intellectual, rational soul. It permeates his being, subtly changing this sense faculty which is similar to, but not identical with, the *vis aestimativa* of the brute. The *vis aestimativa*, given to the animal for his self-preservation and the reproduction of his species, is entirely instinctive in its operation. The *vis cogitativa*, however, has an affinity with the reason. It is, to use the Thomistic terminology, collective of individual intentions as the intellect is collective of universal ones.[8]

It is the *vis cogitativa* in man which is perceptive of the *value*, that is, of the desirability, the worth, of an object. The *vis cogitativa* perceives values; it does not create them, any more than the emotional state itself does. Value is fundamentally objective. A thing may be of itself desirable and capable of being recognized as such, even though we do not here and now desire it. A thing does not become desirable *because* we desire it; we can desire it because it *is* desirable.[9]

The mere recognition of the "static" existence of a value does not necessarily arouse an emotion. Emotion is a correlate of the movement of the sense appetite. Therefore, an emotion is excited not by the mere perception of a value, but when the sense appetite actually tends towards it. When a value is presented, not only as desirable in itself, but as *to be actually desired here and now by me*, in the particular circumstances and state in which I find myself, then the sense appetite, with its emotional accompaniment, is aroused.

It is not within the scope of this article to delve into the detailed

[6] Cf. *Sum. Theol.*, I, q. 78, a. 4.
[7] Cf. *Sum. Theol.*, I, q. 81, a. 3.
[8] Cf. *Sum. Theol.*, I, q. 88, a. 4.
[9] Cf. Herbert Ellsworth Cory, "Value, Beauty and Professor Perry," *The Thomist*, Vol. IV, No. 1 (Jan. 1942); esp. pp. 35–37.

psychological problems of the *vis cogitativa*.[10] But we must not neglect one capital point. The value-object to which the sense appetite actually tends depends for its perception as such on the *vis cogitativa*, which, although bearing an affinity with the reason, is, after all, a *sense* faculty, whose proper object is a particular concrete good embodied, as it were, in matter. When the sense appetite tends towards a good or away from an evil, the more vividly this value has been perceived by the *vis cogitativa*, the stronger the surge of the sense appetite and the more pronounced the emotion. This *vis cogitativa* can also be stimulated by a rational conclusion. As a matter of fact, of its very nature as part of man, it is ordained to be moved by the universal reason.[11] But we can easily realize that the *vis cogitativa* will react most strongly to a *sense* image,—that is, to a particular, concrete, vividly colored and fully delineated "picture" in the human imagination, which is a sense organ and so allied in its very essence to the sensible nature of the *vis cogitativa*.

We may say then, in summary of this Scholastic theory of emotion, that an object which has an aspect of good or bad, of utility or harmfulness in the widest sense, personally affecting the subject in whom the emotion is to be aroused, and presented in such a manner that an inage of it may be formed in the imagination, is admirably calculated to produce an emotional reaction.[12]

### THE PRINCIPLES OF THE APPEAL TO THE EMOTIONS

It would seem from our examination of the Scholastic theory of the nature of emotion that the first and basic principle which must be kept in mind by the preacher is this: *A sermon, in order to arouse emotion, must present a good to be gained or an evil to be avoided.*

This is absolutely fundamental. Emotion is connected with a movement of the sense appetite, which is directed towards a good or away from an evil. We will strive in vain to excite emotion unless an object

[10] The reader who wishes to acquire a fuller knowledge of the nature and workings of this very intriguing faculty may refer to Dr. Rudolf Allers, "The Vis Cogitativa and Evaluation", *The New Scholasticism*, Vol. XV, No. 3 (July 1941).

[11] Cf. *Sum. Theol.*, I, q. 81, a. 3.

[12] It might be well to mention here that when we treat, in the next section, of the arousing of emotion in the hearers of a sermon, the principles suggested are not directly applicable to that peculiar class of feelings known as the "aesthetic emotions." The aesthetic emotions are true emotions. They are not, however, in themselves of a type directly useful in oratorical persuasion, as for instance love or pity. Obviously, though, the *sermon itself*, as a thing of vocal and visual beauty, may produce an aesthetic emotion in its hearers and indirectly, through its beauty, incline them in favor of its "argument."

calculated to arouse that emotion is present in our sermon. No artifice of expression or vividness of terminology or "sob in the voice" will supplement its absence.

Everyone, we suppose, has heard, from time to time, sermons which "rang hollow." In such sermons, it seemed that the preacher was making an exaggerated attempt to achieve an emotional presentation which, for some reason or other, sounded completely false. We venture to suggest that in most such cases, it was the *emotional basis* which was lacking. The speaker tried to build an emotional appeal without a foundation. And no sermon can be delivered intelligently, nor eloquently in the true sense, unless the expression finds an adequate emotional foundation in the object presented.

We should note that this first principle must not be too narrowly interpreted. The "good to be gained", for instance, might well be one which is already *de facto* in the possession of the hearers, but which is not sufficiently appreciated. In as much as a man learns to regard more deeply and prize more highly a good he already possesses, he "gains" conscious possession of it in a fuller, stronger manner.

In proceeding to the enunciation of the second principle, we must remember that a sermon, if it is to appeal to the emotions of its hearers, must not merely contain a good to be gained or an evil to be avoided in general. Since the emotion is to be aroused in the hearers, the emotional object must be a good to be gained *by the hearers*, or an evil to be avoided *by the hearers*. On the strength of this fact, we might phrase the second principle thus: *The good to be gained or the evil to be avoided must be one which personally affects the hearers.*

Aristotle once remarked that all men are persuaded by considerations affecting their own interest. And we are reminded of the saying of Socrates that it is easy to praise Athens to the Athenians. In *L'Orateur Chrêtien*, Sertillanges writes:

> Even when the speaker is occupied with exposition, or discussion, the hearer should be in an emotional state in the sense that it is he whose case is being tried, his cause which is at stake in a spirited debate; he feels that his lot is the wager in the game, that he is being asked to free himself of evil, to conquer the good, which is the passionate desire of every being. The speaker may start from afar; he may have the appearance at certain moments of speaking of something else, of dogmatizing, of describing. But the impression of the goal must always be supreme, stated at the beginning and never abandoned for a single minute. The orator may then be very sure that he is not speaking in vain.[13]

---

[13] A.-D. Sertillanges, O.P., *L'Orateur Chrêtien*, Juvisy (Seine-et-Oise), Les Editions du Cerf, 1930, pp. 256–57. Translation ours.

The third principle is based upon the fact that the *vis cogitativa* is of its very nature a sense faculty, influenced most powerfully (excepting by the actual physical presence of the emotional object), by the *imagination*. It might be worded something like this: *The speaker must clothe his presentation of the subject matter in terms which appeal to the imagination,—that is, in terms which are "picture words," particular, vivid, and concrete.*

The "emotional" delivery of a sermon written in abstractions is an oratorical monstrosity. As a recent author on the subject of public speaking in general remarks:

> One absurdity to avoid in controlling an audience is writing a speech of abstractions and generalities, and then, by intense and forceful delivery, aim to persuade people. Emotions are aroused by concrete situations. What awakens indistinct mental imagery is poor persuasive material, consequently poor in possibilities of delivery. Volume and intensity, when applied to indifferent material, is bombast.[14]

The main difficulty regarding this third principle arises from the fact, not that it is not recognized, but that it is too often emphasized as the *only* necessity, to the exclusion of the other two principles we have mentioned. It must not be forgotten that vivid terminology is simply a means of expressing some *thing*, some object. Without this basic emotional object, mere terminology is unavailing for the arousing of emotion; and very often, when the language is not consonant with the value of the object, merely ridiculous.

In the present paper, we have arrived at the principles of the appeal to the emotions by an *a priori* process starting from the traditional Scholastic theory of the nature of emotion. Our presentation of the principles themselves has been limited to a brief enunciation including only those comments which we felt were necessary for the understanding of their meaning. It is our intention to examine, in a future issue of the *Review*, some examples of classic sermons which had a profound (and historically attested) emotional effect on their hearers, in an attempt to discover whether an analysis of such sermons confirms our *a priori* argument for the necessity of these principles. We also hope to indicate how they may be applied, in a practical manner, to the composition and delivery of a sermon.

*Washington, D. C.* EDMOND DARVIL BENARD.

[14] William R. Duffey, M.A., *Voice and Delivery*, St. Louis, Mo., B. Herder Book Co., 1941, p. 301.

## THE PRESENTATION AND PURIFICATION

Forty days after the birth of Jesus—"when the days of her purification were fulfilled according to the Law of Moses"—Joseph and Mary brought the Child Jesus to Jerusalem in order to carry out two precepts of the Law of the Lord (Luke 2:22–24). One of these precepts commanded the "redemption" of the firstborn son, and the other the "purification" of the mother after childbirth.

Jesus was a firstborn son as defined in the law which St. Luke cites freely: "Every male that opens the womb shall be called holy to the Lord" (cf. Ex. 13:2). A child who "opens the womb" is simply the first born of its mother.[1] If this child was a male, he was given a special dignity by the Law which declared him set apart and dedicated to the Lord, who also claimed as His own the first-fruits of the fields and of animals. The regulation concerning the firstborn sons was made, not only that the people might thus acknowledge God's supreme dominion over His creatures and His first right to them, but also that they might have impressed upon their minds a grateful remembrance of their liberation from Egypt. Parents were directed to give their children the following explanation of the law of the firstborn: "With a strong hand did the Lord bring us forth from the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. For when Pharao was hardened and would not let us go, the Lord slew every firstborn in the land of Egypt, from the firstborn of men to the firstborn of beasts. Therefore I sacrifice to the Lord all of the male sex that opens the womb, and all the firstborn of my sons I redeem" (Ex. 13:14–15; cf. Num. 3:13).

As "holy" or dedicated to the Lord, the firstborn sons would have been set apart for the service of divine worship as priests and ministers. But at the Exodus from Egypt, the Levites were divinely chosen for the ministry of the sanctuary. For the Lord commanded Moses, saying: "I have taken the Levites for all of the firstborn of the children of Israel, and have delivered them for a gift to Aaron and his sons out of

[1] Many commentators thought that "opens the womb" excluded Jesus from this law, while others concluded that the law applied to Him alone. Both views consider the phrase in question as designating the manner of birth. The correct view, followed above, maintains that the phrase simply designates the first, not the manner of birth. It might be noted that the term "holy" in St. Luke's quotation means "dedicated" to the Lord. Regulations on the firstborn are found principally in Ex. 13:12–16; 22:29–30; Lev. 27:26; Num. 8:17–19; 18:15–17.

the midst of the people, to serve me for Israel in the tabernacle of the covenant" (Num. 8:18–19; 3:41–45). Though this regulation exempted parents from dedicating their firstborn sons to the ministry of the Temple and divine worship—in fact, made such a dedication impossible—they were required to acknowledge God's claim to their son by presenting him to the Lord and buying him back: "And the redemption of it shall be after one month, for five shekels of silver by weight of the sanctuary" (Num. 18:16; Ex. 34:20).

It was not required that the firstborn son be brought to the Temple. The "presentation," called a "redemption" in the Law, could be made by merely paying the five shekels to a priest in the district in which the family lived.[2] But, going to the Temple for the rite of purification, Mary and Joseph brought the Child Jesus with them in order to fulfil this precept of the Law. The arrival of the Holy Family in the Temple to offer and dedicate the divine child to the Lord was an event of sublime importance. Then was fulfilled for the first time the prophecy of Malachias: "Presently the Lord, whom you seek, and the angel of the testament, whom you desire, shall come to this Temple" (Mal. 3:1; cf. Agg. 2:7–9).

Coming into His Father's house for the first time, Christ renewed the dedication of Himself to the Father. As Son of God, He needed not to be "bought free" from the Temple service; as Son of Man and Messiah, He had dedicated Himself wholly to the service of the Father at the Incarnation. St. Paul describes this dedication in the words of Psalm 39: "Coming into the world, he [Christ] says: Sacrifice and oblation thou wouldst not, but a body thou hast fitted to me: in holocausts and sin-offerings thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I: Behold, I come . . . to do thy will, O God" (Heb. 10:5–7). Jesus was presented in the Temple to fulfil the will of the Father as expressed in the Old Law, and to begin the oblation which would be completed by the immolation of Himself upon the cross.

The second precept of the Law, the "purification," placed an obligation upon the mother alone. For the understanding of the precept

[2] The presentation or redemption of the firstborn seems to have had no other rite than the payment of the five shekels, though some conclude from certain statements in the Law that bringing the child to the sanctuary was at least recommended. Attention may be called to the erroneous view that a sacrifice was offered for the redemption of the firstborn, an error due to confusing the presentation with the purification. The two were wholly distinct, the first being required only for the firstborn and the second after every childbirth. St. Luke mentions them together because the Holy Family fulfilled both at the same time.

and its fulfilment by Mary, a knowledge of the nature and purpose of the "uncleanness" and "purification" laws should prove helpful.

### UNCLEANNESS UNDER THE OLD LAW

No set of laws in the Old Testament, or perhaps elsewhere, exerted such an extensive influence on man's daily life and conduct as the regulations about legal or levitical uncleanness and purification. According to these laws, contained principally in Leviticus (c. 11–15) and Numbers (c. 19), certain corporal functions and conditions defiled a man before God. The consequences of this defilement were exclusion for a time from divine service and from the society of men. Uncleanness was transmitted not only to persons but also to inanimate objects by contact with unclean persons or things. The Law distinguished three principal sources of defilement: the human corpse and animal carcass, leprosy, genital functions; or, uncleanness arising from those things that pertain to death and to sexual life. Uncleanness had different degrees according to its different immediate causes; and the rite of purification, by which the defilement was removed, corresponded to the degree of uncleanness. The simplest defilement lasted until the evening of the day on which it was contracted and was removed by washing the body and clothing. When the uncleanness lasted seven days or longer, the purification was completed by a sacrifice, as in the purification of a mother after childbirth.

For a proper appreciation of these laws levitical uncleanness, which was something external, must be distinguished from moral uncleanness, which is internal. Levitical uncleanness, so named because it was religious in its purpose and effects and was regulated principally by the laws of Leviticus, did not of itself entail or suppose the moral uncleanness of sin. For it followed upon good and lawful acts and conditions, as marital relations and childbirth, was attached to states over which man had no control, as death and certain diseases, and was contracted through inadvertence, error and even in sleep. The regulations generally took into consideration only the physical aspect of the corporal functions and conditions by which one was made unclean, and this independently of man's free will. These things defiled, not because they are sinful in themselves or in their circumstances, but because they arise from original sin and manifest in a particular manner the effect of sin upon the life of man.

The relation existing between legal defilement and sin is easily seen in the three sources of levitical uncleanness. Death entered the world

through the sin of Adam and is a penalty of sin: leprosy is a corruption of the living body and bears a likeness to death; sexual life is especially subject to the influence of sin and in a particular manner shows the power of evil concupiscence, the most evident effect of original sin. Because of this relation to sin, the consequences of levitical uncleanness as well as the rites of purification were of a religious and pedagogical nature. The care required for the avoidance of uncleanness reminded man of the weakness of fallen nature, sharpened the consciousness of sin and its penalty, and excited a desire for redemption through the Messiah.

External or corporal cleanness, maintained through avoidance of legal defilement or regained through levitical purification, was a symbol of internal cleanness and an admonition to seek the moral purity desired by the Lord God of Israel. Thus, Deut. 21:6 commanded the judges to wash their hands as a sign and declaration that they were free of crime; and in Isaias 1:16 God unites external and internal cleanness in the admonition: "Wash yourselves, be clean, take away the evil of your desires." Having been chosen out of all other nations and made the people of God, Israel was endued with a special dignity and obligated to a higher degree of moral purity than the Gentiles. It was altogether fitting and proper that this dignity should also appear in external custom and that Israel should represent itself as a pure and holy nation. An assertion of this dignity and a representation of this moral purity was contained in the levitical purifications. Even external uncleanness must be removed by these rites if one wished to be fully united with the religious community and approach to worship the all-holy and pure God.

Israel's election and special relation to God is stated expressly as the motive for the laws on uncleanness and purification. At the end of the regulations about clean and unclean animals, the first in this series of laws, God said: "I am the Lord your God: be holy because I am holy. Defile not yourselves by any creeping creature that moves upon the earth. For I am the Lord who brought you out of the land of Egypt, that I might be your God" (Lev. 11:43–45). The people were commanded to keep all external uncleanness from their camp, because "the Lord thy God walks in the midst of thy camp . . . Let thy camp be holy, and let no uncleanness appear therein, lest He go away from thee" (Deut. 23:14). The levitical purifications were, therefore, a continuous reminder of Israel's vocation and a symbol of man's desire to be pure and holy in the sight of God. Their principal purpose was

to foster the interior and moral purity which God expected from a people whom He had chosen as His own. This was the spirit underlying the letter of the Law; but where this spirit was lacking, frequent cleansings and washings became the pharisaic formalism and hypocrisy denounced by our Lord.[3]

### THE PURIFICATION OF MARY

According to the enactment of Leviticus 12:1–8, childbirth rendered the mother unclean, seven days if the child was a boy and fourteen days if it was a girl. To the respective days of uncleanness there were added thirty-three or sixty-six days, according to the sex of the newly born child, and the entire period of forty or eighty days was called "the days of her purification." It was commanded that during these days "she shall touch no holy thing, neither shall she enter into the sanctuary." When the days of purification were completed, the mother was to present herself at the sanctuary and there offer two sacrifices: a yearling lamb and a turtledove or a young pigeon. The first was offered as a holocaust—a sacrifice of adoration and thanksgiving in which the whole victim was burnt upon the altar. The holocaust held the first place among the sacrifices and was the highest act of external worship in the Old Law. The turtledove or pigeon constituted a sin-offering—an expiatory sacrifice, the main element of which was the pouring of the victim's blood at the altar, and was required to complete the rite of purification. As in other places, so also here the Old Law showed consideration for the poor by prescribing that they offer a turtledove or young pigeon as a holocaust instead of a lamb.

The wording of this particular law plainly indicates that the "uncleanness" was due solely to the corporal state or condition of the mother after childbirth. The law in no way implies that a mother becomes guilty of moral fault by giving birth or that childbirth itself is something unclean or humiliating. The absence of moral guilt as a result of childbirth is also indicated by the smallness of the sin-offering prescribed for the purification of the mother. This is further substantiated by the nature and significance of Old Testament levitical

[3] Another general, though secondary, purpose of these laws was to promote reverence for whatever pertained to divine worship. A particular purpose is seen in some of the regulations: to remove danger of seduction by practices connected with idolatry; to safeguard public health; to foster more cultured manners. Cf. *Sum. Theol.*, I–II, q. 105, a. 5 ad 4m.

uncleanness, treated above, and by the view on motherhood and childbirth set forth in the sacred writings. In Israel, as among all normally constituted peoples, the birth of a child, especially of a son, was an occasion of joy, a joy that finds approval in the Scriptures. Barrenness was looked upon as a reproach, even as a sign of divine disfavor, while fecundity was declared a blessing of the Lord who gave the child to its mother.[4]

St. Luke follows the wording of the Law when he mentions that Mary fulfilled "the days of purification" and offered the prescribed sacrifices. It should be noted that, in three verses (22–24), the Evangelist thrice states that the "presentation" and "purification" were carried out according to the Law of the Lord. Mary, he tells us, made the offering of the poor as prescribed in Leviticus. From this fact, commentators rightly conclude that the Holy Family was poor,—which should not be taken to mean that they lived in abject poverty.

Mary, the Immaculate, required no purification from sin; neither did she require the external levitical purification prescribed by Leviticus. The reason for her exemption lies in the fact that she gave birth to Jesus in a virginal manner. There was not present in her the corporal condition that accompanies and follows ordinary childbirth which was a source of levitical uncleanness. Strictly speaking therefore, Mary was under no obligation to observe the days of purification or to make the sin-offering which, it should be remembered, did not of itself imply personal sin in her who made the offering. But since the mystery of the Virgin Birth had not yet been made known to men and the law itself made no explicit exception, the humble and prudent Virgin Mother had no thought of dispensing herself. She did not anticipate God's own time for revealing her privileges, but followed the custom of pious women in fulfilling all things required by the Law of God, lest she appear singular or give offense. In humility and obedience she was the first to become conformed to the Son of God who subjected Himself to circumcision and all other burdens of the Law for our instruction and redemption.

### SIMEON'S CANTICLE AND PROPHECY

The glory of the Only Begotten of the Father, which shone forth at times during His humiliation, manifested itself also at the Presentation. When He who is Lord of the Temple entered its sacred precincts as a

[4] For the joy at childbirth, cf. Gen. 21:6; 24:60; 1 K. 2:1 ff; Ruth 4:11; John 16:21. The reproach of barrenness, Gen. 30:1–2; Osee 9:12; I K. 1:5–6. The blessing of fecundity, Gen. 29:31–32; Deut. 30:9; Ps. 112:9.

helpless infant and subject to the Law, He was greeted and magnified by a representative of the prophets who had foretold His coming. The witness chosen to bear testimony to Christ on this occasion was a man named Simeon. In one of his brief but comprehensive character sketches, St. Luke pronounces a perfect eulogy upon him. Simeon, he tells us, was a just and devout man, endowed with the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit, having an unshaken faith and an ardent longing for Him whom God had promised for the consolation of Israel. In response to his ardent and pious desire, it had been revealed to him that he should not die before he had seen the Christ. Led by the Holy spirit, he came to the Temple as the Holy Family were entering to present Jesus to the Lord.[5] By an inner illumination he immediately recognized Jesus as the longed-for Messiah. The desire of a lifetime is now realized, the promise made to him is fulfilled; and Simeon expresses his thoughts and emotions in a prophetical canticle of praise and thanksgiving.

The *Nunc Dimittis* of Simeon is divided into three strophes of two members each. In the first strophe (v. 29) Simeon gives thanks to God because he is now to be released from his long vigil and service, and because he can now depart this life in peace. Each word of the strophe is expressive. "Thy servant, O Lord" presents a strong antithesis, especially in Greek. Simeon is a slave—*doulos*, and the Lord is his absolute Master—*despota*, who disposes of all as He wills. The Greek verb for "dismiss" ordinarily expresses a boon or happy deliverance, as the liberation of a slave or the release of a captive. Both "now" and "in peace" are to be joined with "dismiss" and follow from the promise made to him by his Master.

In the second strophe (30–31) Simeon states the reason for his gratitude and perfect peace. Not from afar in vision, nor by faith only, but with his bodily eyes he has seen what many prophets and just men desired to see (cf. Matt. 13:17). "Thy salvation" may designate the Messianic salvation as described and foretold by the prophets of old and as now seen by Simeon in the person of Christ. The phrase: "Salvation of the Lord" means the salvation which comes from the Lord, a work of His infinite mercy; and also points to Christ whom God

[5] The time of the meeting is certain from St. Luke's narrative. He first mentions the two precepts of the Law as the reason for the Holy Family's presence in Jerusalem, then describes the meeting with Simeon when they "brought the child in" (v. 27), and finally, without giving details of the actual fulfilment of the precepts states that they fulfilled all things as prescribed in the Law (v. 39). It follows that the meeting took place before the purification of Mary and that Simeon had no part in this rite.

sent for the salvation of mankind. Simeon with his eyes directly saw the Savior; by faith and in prophetic vision he also beheld the blessings which the Savior would offer to all. Taught by the Holy Spirit, he understood and declared anew what had been foretold: Christ was promised and sent for all peoples of the earth, i.e. for both Jew and Gentile. The expression: "Prepared before the face," may contain the idea of a feast or banquet, a figure used in the Scriptures to designate the abundance of blessings provided in the Messianic Kingdom.

The third strophe (32), which depends on the "prepared" of the preceding verse, describes the work of Christ, the Salvation of the Lord, in a special relation to the two great divisions of mankind at that time. Christ is "a light of revelation" to the Gentiles. They had hitherto lived in darkness of ignorance and sin, deprived of the light of divine revelation. Now the Messiah appears as "the Orient from on high" (Luke 1:78), as the Light of the World, in order to dispel this darkness and cause the light of grace and truth to shine upon them. Israel, in distinction to the Gentiles, already possessed divine revelation in the Old Testament; and though Israel would also be illumined by the Messiah, Simeon emphasizes the glory that He shed upon the nation.

A glorious program and future were envisioned by Simeon. But, after he blessed Mary and Joseph, felicitating them on having such close relations with Christ, he received another revelation which added dark shadows to the picture of the future. Not all would accept the Savior; many would not avail themselves of the light and salvation, but oppose it.

Simeon sees a two-fold result of the mission of Christ: "This child is destined for the fall and the rise of many in Israel." Isaias had foretold that only a remnant of Israel would be saved, that the Lord would be a sanctification to Israel, but also a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense (cf. Is. 8:14; 10:22). These and like passages, taken in connection with Rom. 9:1–33 and 1 Peter 2:8, show that the prophets foretold the refusal of many to accept the Messiah, a refusal which would bring eternal ruin.

"A sign that shall be contradicted" also explains the cause and occasion of ruin. Christ is represented by Simeon as a sign which cannot be ignored, as a standard to which all men are called, but against which many shall rebel. When this standard is manifested, men divide into two camps, either with Christ or against Him. There can be no middle course, no compromise, because He presents the only way to salvation. The contradiction and persecution of the Son will

not be without effect on the Mother. "Thy own soul a sword shall pierce," is a figure which foretells, not physical injury or suffering, but sorrow and anguish of soul comparable to the physical suffering caused by the death blow of a sword. As opposition to Jesus began at His birth and increased until it reached its climax at the crucifixion, so also the sorrows of Mary grew with the opposition to Christ and became like a sword that pierced her heart as she stood beneath the Cross of Calvary.

The last words of the prophecy: "That the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed," states a resultant consequence or effect of the sign's manifestation to the world.[6] When Christ appeared, it became manifest who were the true worshippers of God. The secrets of hearts were laid bare, the already existing infidelity of the leaders was made known by the malice with which they opposed the doctrines of Christ, the worldliness of the people was manifested in the indifference they showed towards the spiritual Kingdom He preached and established.

*Norwood, Ohio* RAYMOND F. STOLL

[6] Many understand the last words of the prophecy to refer to the "sword" and give various opinions on the meaning of both (cf. Lapide, *in loco*). The better opinion understands the phrase as giving the result of the contradiction of the sign, from which another opinion, which understands the phrase as the effect of all that precedes it, does not differ to any great extent.

## PURPLE AND VIOLET

As an intermission between weightier subjects why not consider colors, at least some of them? Purple and violet, for example.

The writer began his education in a public school kindergarten. Of the little he learned there he remembers nothing, except colors and their names. That was due to his meeting the subject again soon after, on transferring to a parochial school. Here he heard about the colors used by the priest at Mass. "In Advent," so he thought he heard, "the priest is vested in purple." He seemed to remember purple described at kindergarten as "a rich color, the color of splendor," and he had a clear recollection of it. He watched, but failed to see it. The Advent weeks passed; he decided he had misunderstood the Sister. She must have referred to Christmas, when *everything* is splendid. He waited for Christmas; but to his keen disappointment, white was the color used by the priest. (It was a period, of course, when cloth of gold was rarely seen in churches.)

No further thought was given to the subject for many years. Childhood recedes from us with many questions left unanswered and vague memories that never clear up. The observer became quite accustomed to seeing violet repeated in the Advent and Lenten seasons. But in his high school physics that morsel of knowledge he had tasted at kindergarten was revived in startling fashion. The prism and spectrum! They confirmed that rudimentary lesson in colors.

Nevertheless he was still in the dark about that "purple" the Sister said the priest used in Advent. It was only after ordination that the mystery was solved. Associating with priests and Sister-sacristans, the discovery was made that violet was intended when the Sister in first grade described the priest's vestments in Advent as purple. His experience through many years of priesthood has corroborated only too amply that discovery, namely, that practically all priests and Sisters call violet purple. You never so much as hear the word violet among them. But they are not the only offenders. This false nomenclature is common to all classes, even florists, some artists, and especially department store clerks. It pervades literature, too, even from the time of Scott and Shakespeare. Yet it is neither scientific nor historic, nor the practice of discriminating writers.

For a first point of difference, it ought to be said that violet is a

liturgical color, but purple is not. Purple is a prelatial color—the color of prelates from patriarchs and arch-bishops (who are not cardinals) to domestic prelates. But I must say, I saw a bishop recently with a zucchetto of magenta which rather clashed with his purple mantelletta. I have seen monsignori varying in colors from dull dubonet, which does not even belong to the purple family, all the way up to magenta or even rose pink. Our bishops, however, are generally very consistent in adhering to royal purple, in which they carry on the tradition of imperial and senatorial dignity. And I think our monsignori, if they lapse from that standard, are the victims of their drapers.

Violet is, of course, the color of penance and mourning. Let me enumerate here a few of the absurdities I have come on in the mis-calling it purple. A chaplain at a girl's college once introduced a monsignor on *Gaudete* Sunday with the words, "When Holy Mother Church puts aside momentarily the morose and penitential purple to don the festive rose, etc." The speaker in due course rose and wittingly acknowledged the introduction by saying: "Well, here I am with my morose and penitential purple, if you don't mind." There was not a ripple of a laugh; the witticism went over the heads of the audience, and, apparently over the head of the well-meaning chaplain too.

The writer has been at many Confirmations in his time, but he has yet to see anything but a violet cushion prepared on the altar step for the bishop. Presumably the English ceremonial, in prescribing purple, intends a color that matches the choir dress of the bishop; but violet is the color the pastor or the Sister-sacristan understands by that name. What place can sombre, mournful violet, the nearest thing to black, have at a Confirmation? At least the bishop does not wear it.

The Latin ceremonials have "*violaceus*," it is true; but it ought to be observed that the Italians (generally the writers of those manuals) have long had the habit of using the same *violaceo*, not only for blue violet (the true spectrum violet and the color of the flower), but also for red violet (orchid) and even purple. So, they call the color for bishops and monsignori *violaceo*. In past years in Italy I occasionally saw a bishop appearing in true violet. A monsignor I know, and who knows his colors, had that lugubrious color on at the laying of a church corner stone. As we were friends, I could make that free to taunt him about wearing mourning on such a festive occasion. But he disposed of my question very satisfactorily. When he received his elevation,

he had the vesture made, in accordance with the instructions in his Latin manual. On going to Rome, however, not long after, he was told it was all wrong. They showed him purple, but still called it "*violaceo*." "The name is so broad and indeterminate with them," he said, "you have to be shown to know what they mean." As the original garb consisted of very light material, he had decided it would be cooler on that hot August afternoon than his regular purple outfit. The Italians very grudgingly employ the name purple (*porpura*). At least they never squander it on violet.

*Costume of Prelates*, by Nainfa falls victim to the common confusion. Father Nainfa, of course, does no more than carry over into an English setting the inconsistencies and contradictions found in those "*violaceus*" Latin manuals. So it will be convenient to quote him, but put the blame on them.

For example: "Purple, or violet, is a sign both of Prelature and Livery. It especially characterizes the Prelature and the Episcopacy."[1] And "The purple cassock is a festival or court dress."[2] So far so good for purple (but hardly for violet). And then a somersault! "Purple is the color to be used by Cardinals in times of penance and mourning."[3] And "Purple is the color of the Episcopal Livery, such as . . . members of the diocesan Seminary."[4] In the first two examples he is talking about purple, without a doubt; in the two others, he is bewildering the reader unless he intends violet. I have seen cardinals at funerals and Good Friday ceremonies dressed in violet, not purple; and in my time at Rome the students of the Vatican College (Rome's diocesan seminary), wore a violet,[5] not purple, costume. What the Latin books call by the one name "*violaceus*," is found to be the two different colors—purple and violet—in the actual practice of prelates. It is the oral directions, or demonstrative samples of cloth, that the prelates have to be guided by, rather than the letter in the books.

Now maybe I ought to define, or at least describe, purple, so that it will be clear what this discussion is about. The easiest way to distinguish purple and violet is to say that purple belongs to the red family, violet to the blue. They are both secondary colors, that is, blends; they are mixtures of red and blue. But in purple the red

[1] Nainfa, *Costume of Prelates*, Westminster, Md., Newman Book Shop, p. 35.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 46.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 36, 45.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 36.
[5] Rather something between heliotrope and lavender.

predominates and the blue is subordinate; in violet the blue predominates and the red is subdued.

Dictionaries define purple as "a color of mingled red and blue, between crimson and violet" (Standard dictionary). Or again, as "a color made in various shades by blending the colors blue and red; formerly, especially among the Greeks and Romans, a deep crimson, also called Tyrean purple" (The New Winston Dictionary). "The ancient words which are translated purple are supposed to have been used for the color we call crimson" (Webster's Dictionary). This is not precisely a scientific approach, but only as the eye analyzes the colors.

Still resting in description, it may be observed that the purple family ranges from light rose pink, down through magenta (an intense pink suffused with blue), cerise, rose red, crimson, carmine, royal purple, mulberry, cherry, and eggplant. Its distinguishing characteristic always is, that it is a red modified by blue, but primarily a red. A clerk at a church goods store remarked when I had discussed the subject of purple with him, that "it was therefore what we now call fuschia or else amaranthine red"; and I was glad to admit he was not far wrong.

Violet is darkened blue with a faint tinge of red. The addition of black and red to original azure blue, or red added to indigo, gives it its distinction of a rich compound blue. Again, that would not be the chemist's formula; but the elements the eye detects. Interest here, of course, is in how to identify purple and violet, not how to produce them. The sapphire and amethyst (grayish violet) among the gems, and the fumes of heated iodine, are good examples of violet. Lilac late in its season and lavender are pale tints of violet; in other words, faded violet. Just so, rose pink may be considered faded purple. That is another key to the difference between purple and violet.

Purple, therefore, and violet are as distinct from one another as red and orange, or green and blue. All worthwhile treatises on the physics of color tell about and illustrate purple and violet as distinct colors, as a matter of course. And in applied science, such as the dyeing industry and medicine, there are terms in common use that illustrate the distinction. For example: crystal violet, ethyl violet, gentian violet, violet ray. What doctor, or nurse, or technician would ever think of substituting the word purple in any of those labels for violet? Here we may add the testimony of the *British Dictionary of Colors*, as an authority. It is a collection of sample ribbons fast dyed,

showing 220 colors officially approved by The British Color Council, for the guidance of the British mercantile trade. Royal purple and imperial purple have their ribbons there, and violet has others of its own. The Dictionary comments on the confusion sometimes found between purple and violet, and warns against using the terms haphazardly.

In the Passion story according to St. Matthew, it may be noted, the robe put on Our Lord as a mock king is called cochineal, which is standard red, or sometimes scarlet or henna; whereas in St. Mark it is called purple. This can be explained by what Paul Rodier says in his *Romance of French Weaving*:

> From her shores, in the days of her greatness, she (Tyre) had gathered thorny sea creatures (the murex) and purged them of a color so glorious that "purple" and Tyre became eternally associated. And what thrones have owed their glorious magic upon multitudes to that color, kept for royal use? But we must always remember that it was likely to have been from the beginning—not the purple we know—but a rich crimson, a richer and less mysterious color, than that in which blue merges with red.[6]

Certainly it was not violet or any dark blue. That quotation of Rodier also explains the term "*patres purpurati*" applied to cardinals, and the term "*purpurati martyres*." Yet since cardinal red or scarlet today is cochineal with a tinge of orange, it may be held a departure up the spectrum scale from original purple; just as the present day purple worn by bishops, may be considered a drift down from the bright crimson lightly tinged with blue that constituted the ancient "color of splendor." In the case of the princes of the Church and the martyrs, the title of *purpurati* signifies both color and nobility. At any rate, with these facts and this symbolism we are brought far away indeed from the misuse of the name purple for anything so dull as violet.

Among writers, as well as the general public, we must make allowances for the loose use of all descriptive words, especially color names. "To turn purple" in the face, for example, while a correct description for blushing, is wrong for the color produced by fear and anger. "Blue in the face" would then be right. There are both purple and violet (sapphire, etc.) in the sea and the sunset under varying conditions of sunlight and atmosphere. From merely reading a description, without seeing for ourselves, we have to take the poet or writer at his word.

[6] New York, Frederick A. Stokes Co., p. 21.

A writer may be skilled in his proper art but not, on that account, precise in his word meanings. On the other hand, there are discriminating writers, not so eminent in the literary field, who know their colors. One tourist author some years past gave her book the title *Athens the Violet Crowned*,[7] borrowing Pindar's expression. The encircling hills were violet-clad to Pindar; but this author applies the title to the color effected by the shadows draping their slopes in the early forenoon or late afternoon. "One may look through the columns," she writes, "and see as a wonderful background the deep violet shades of the slopes of Hymettus."[8] Again: "The two peaks of Pentellicus and Lycabettus are seen in violet hues warmed with rose."[9] In the bright sun, however, "not far from the shore lies the island of Egina, in purple distance fair."[10] "Cliffs of Corfu of richest violet, rose shadowed against the sky."[11] "A bold headland shimmering in the sunset rose above a violet sea."[12] Always shade or partial darkness for violet; the brilliance of noonday for purple! At sunrise and sunset, both purple and sapphire tints adorn the clouds, but sapphire (violet) usually prevails over the land or sea between sun and observer. Another author, Marie, Queen of Rumania, describes a sun "setting in a colossal blaze . . . every possible and impossible tint of flaming gold, orange, amber gold, with sudden unexpected streaks of burning violet . . . lavender blue."[13]

Many authors could be quoted here who know their colors and who unhesitatingly and consistently use the name violet when that is called for and never miscall it purple; and on the other hand, correctly use purple in its turn. Why then should not we priests show that discrimination and accuracy? Royalty long ago gave up purple; it now prefers scarlet, velvet in several colors, white and gold (braid). The fashion world has no longer any taste for purple or even fuchsia (an approximation to purple). The general public as a result no longer knows true purple; yet it likes the name and misapplies it. The Church in its admirable conservatism retains the two colors, the one for its prelates, the other for its liturgy.

[7] Lillian Whiting, *Athens the Violet Crowned*, Boston, Little, Brown and Company. 1913.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 54.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 59.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 74.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 245.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 251.
[13] *The Story of My Life*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, p. 524.

This writer's contention is that the clergy should know these colors and constitute an authority in naming and defining them. We do not follow sheepishly the vacillating and guessing public in other things. For example, in architecture we do not call a corbel a capital; a portico a clerestory; a nave a narthex. Likewise in business, music, philosophy, we use the terminology fixed by those who specialize in those lines. In this small matter of colors, why not consult science, and art, and history, which alone set the true standard for them?

*Trenton, N. J.* WALTER GREENE

## THE SPIRITUAL CARE OF RELIGIOUS

There is no priest who does not realize the immense import of the spiritual care of our Nuns. The valiant legion of Nuns that we possess in this country prompts us to cast a glance at the relationship that must exist between the priest and the religious community of which he has charge. It is with particular attention that we view the relationship of the confessor to the religious penitent.

In the first place the priest who has charge of a religious community should be well convinced of the necessity and the importance of his task. The quality and the character of the work of the Nuns seek their *elan* from the spiritual life within their souls. That spiritual source must be guarded with the utmost care. Many are the dangers which assail it. We all understand the depressing effects of confinement; we all know how natural it is to suffer from the companionship of too small an intimate group; we are cognizant of the effort that must be daily expended to meet the sacrifices of a severe rule of life. True, every life has its sacrifices but the religious life of Nuns is peculiar in this respect, that it offers no occasional period of escape from the surroundings of everyday life. These are a few of the reasons which insinuate the need of a vitally active spiritual life.

The need of an active spiritual life—well formed and guided—is largely filled by the priest who has the spiritual guidance of the community. Secular priests often play a very important role in the Nuns' lives without realizing the grandeur of their role. The food for the spiritual life is furnished by the priest. Daily Mass is the first requisite for a community of Sisters: Mass without fail except when it is imperatively necessary to omit it and Mass on time so that the Sisters may have sufficient leisure for their thanksgiving and for all other tasks that await them before the school or the hospital day begins; Mass fervently celebrated so that it will be an inspiration and a source of spiritual solace for the Sisters; Mass said in accordance with the Community's particular devotions if this is possible—their feasts, intentions etc. If a Votive Mass is said, the Sisters should be notified ahead of time so that they may follow the Mass in their Missals.

It is the duty of the confessor to be well instructed in his role. The Sacrament of Penance should play a better role in the lives of all Catholics and it is imperative that this Sacrament be well administered

to those whose vocation it is to seek spiritual perfection. The Church has gone to all lengths to assure perfect functioning of this part of Religious Life. The Code enjoins upon all Religious weekly confession. It provides six different categories of confessors: the ordinary, the extraordinary, the occasional, the special, the *adeat* confessor and lastly the confessor for the sick Sister.

How shall the confessor fulfill his task? The Code does not intend and could not prescribe the minute details of this mission. The confessor must deduce that he has the obligation of presenting himself to the community each week since all religious have the obligation of going to confession at least once a week. Promptness and regularity in carrying out this obligation will sustain the spiritual life of the Nuns. Lack of regularity will eventually end in ill-prepared confessions. Confession will become of little value in the quest of spiritual perfection because it will be over and done with in the odd moments of the confessor's day. It will have something trivial both for the confessor and the penitent. As in the case of the breviary the more dilatory we are, the more tedious does the *onus* become. Then too in our case there is always the danger of getting accustomed to the state of venial sin and this mentality and fact will not lead to the summits of perfection in the spiritual realm.

The Code warns confessors not to meddle in the internal or external management of the community. It would be most imprudent for the confessor to use anything heard in confession or apropos of confession in order to correct this or that fault on the part of the Rule or the Superior. There would be danger of violating the Seal and of preverting the role of confessor. The confessor must not be made the tool or the victim of circumstances or of policies. His role is similar to that of a compass: the confessor should raise his voice but for one purpose, namely, to show to the individual soul the surest and most efficacious way to God. In matters that he can settle in the confessional he should act with the utmost confidence and authority before God and man; in matters that rest in the hands of others he must be most circumspect and rather unwilling to even voice an opinion except in the most guarded terms and suggestions. The confessor's work must be kept very impersonal, if it is to bear fruit. In the minds of the Sisters, the confessor must be totally above and beyond all community contact—even to the suppression of the ordinary marks of social contact.

Each priest has his own technique in administering the Sacrament

of Penance. The priest's personality, sanctity, ideals and erudition will ultimately determine his success as a confessor. It would seem that a very serious problem faces the Nuns' confessor. In the first place his penitents are not by any means the ordinary ones. They are bound by vow to tend towards a greater spiritual perfection. This perfection consists in living to the utmost degree in union with God, and practically speaking this is done by inculcating deeper and deeper into our lives the theological and supernatural moral virtues. In the confessional we render an account of our progress to ourselves and to God and no one can deny that in the confessional we are spurred on to greater effort in God's love. The confessor holds the key to progress or to retrogression. The confessor then must not only give absolution but he must give spiritual guidance to the nuns. He must remember that in any Religious Institute first things come first and that the mind of the Church is that all religious strive to their utmost to become daily more like their Master. Our teaching, our hospital work, all our other great endeavors are monuments to an ideal that is graven in the hearts and minds of those who toil therein—"It is not I who lives but God who lives in me". The Nun-penitent then must make special demands upon the confessor.

Many may be tempted to remark that it is not within the province of the confessor to promote the religious spirit of the nuns. I think that today, especially since the waning popularity of the manifestation of conscience is so general, that it is the confessor who can most effectively develop the religious spirit in each individual nun. It is indeed the confessor who can provide for the personal needs of the soul. Then again the task of the confessor is made more difficult by the type of confession. His task will be more concerned with venial sins at the most—and in a greater degree with imperfections. The spiritual care that he will be called upon to give will be more a question of increasing the positive side of sanctification than eradicating sin and the roots thereof. It will be more the task of replacing imperfect contrition with that of perfect love.

The confessor therefore that simply will give absolution to such penitents or who gives short exhortations on a general topic or who will lay stress upon this or that imperfection will find himself of little value to most of his penitents after a short while. He will doubt of the matter of such confessions. He will question the concomitant sorrow. I imagine that in every confessor's life there comes the conviction that human beings can rise to a certain perfection in the

negative way—by not committing sin—but that a certain substratum of sin will always remain until a new manner of life is injected into the soul. This new, ever-increasing manner of life must be the conscious, ever-active supernatural organism.

Such must be the case of Nuns. Negatively they must be well advanced after their first years of religious life but they cannot advance unless the supernatural virtues and the ladder of spiritual perfection are resorted to daily. I think that it is the confessor's role to inject that new life and to keep it growing stronger and stronger with each weekly confession.

That new life will be derived from an adequate and intimate acquaintanceship with Ascetical and Mystical Theology. Under the tutelage of the confessor the Nun should be taught to live the theory of the spiritual life in all its amplitude. The confessor should be the guide in the application and the adaptation of the theory to the individual soul. It is the role of the confessor to purify, orientate, encourage our motives, enthusiasm and strivings for the things of God. The confessor then should attend to any personal problem of the penitent and at the same time initiate and perfect the penitent into a deeper understanding and practice of the principles of Ascetical and Mystical Theology. He should nurture that life by postulating weekly applications to the penitent's life. In this way he will eradicate sin and its roots and he will increase the love of God in the heart of the penitent not only by word but also by deed. The Nun will come nearer to God.

How shall one proceed? The time allotted for each penitent should not exceed five minutes. The confessor should procure a manual of Mystical and Ascetical Theology. Each visit to the convent should be preceded by the preparation of a talk of two or three minutes on some topic of the spiritual life. These talks must be given in an orderly, systematic fashion. In a few words he should present to each penitent a succinct notion of his subject, making it practical and especially directed to stir the soul to action in a given avenue or at least to inspire the soul with greater generosity and attention in the service of the Master. As a supplementary measure the confessor might assign a few pages of his manual for community reading during the week following his visit. Thus he will consolidate the personal talk to each Sister. Furthermore, the topic chosen for each week could be taken for the subject of a particular examen or for spiritual exercises of personal initiative.

The priest who is deputed to hear Sisters' confessions has within his

grasp the opportunity of forming an *élite* in Christian Perfection for the glory of God and the edification of His Church. The Nuns' confessor should be a real spiritual director. Every priest can aim at that accomplishment. The confessor should not only fight sin, he should instil a greater life in the Nun's soul and this will be done by the untiring application of the theory of Ascetical and Mystical Theology. In few, well-chosen words each week he should lead his penitent not only to the knowledge but to the practice of the Science of the Saints. One hour thus spent in the service of a community of Nuns will profit the Cause of Christ much more than a day spent on good but by far less deserving objects of the priest's attention.

*Pittsfield, Mass.* WILLIAM F. ALLEN

## THE EXTENSION OF CHRIST'S MYSTICAL BODY

The term "Mystical Body of Christ" is only one of many names employed in sacred theology to designate the Catholic Church. Certain theologians, among them the great controversialists John Eck[1] and Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius[2] have used the term body of Christ as a definition of the Church. This practice has been countenanced and encouraged by our Holy Father Pope Pius XII in his Encyclical *Mystici Corporis*.[3] Objectively there is no one of all the traditional names better fitted to aid men in appreciating the Church.

However, there have been those who thought that the term Mystical Body of Christ applied more properly to some group or organization wider in extent than the Catholic Church. These men have held that persons in this world who are in the state of grace, and who are not members of the Catholic Church are still members of the Mystical Body of Christ. Some have even feared that the application of the name Mystical Body to the visible Church militant of the New Testament would in some way imply that the blessed in heaven and the souls in purgatory are not members of this Body. At all events they have taught that the Catholic Church, properly so called, has an extension narrower than that of the Mystical Body.

We can best meet this attitude by comparing the traditional definitions of the Catholic Church with the Pauline declarations about the body of Christ. The Church which St. Paul designated as the body of Christ is the same organization which has been defined and described in Catholic ecclesiology.

Now it happens that there are three distinct types of definitions of the Catholic Church. All of them have legitimate scriptural and traditional background, but they did not enter the literature of scholastic ecclesiology together. Since the beginning of the seventeenth century, however, theologians have used the three types together to explain the nature of the Catholic Church.

St. Robert Bellarmine's classical formula is the best example of the

[1] Cf. *Enchiridion Locorum Communium Ioannis Eckii adversus Lutheranos, Ab authore iam quarto recognitum.* Venice, 1533, cap. 1, fol. 1, recto.

[2] Cf. *Confessio Catholicae Fidei Christiana*, cap. 20; in the *Opera Omnia*, Cologne, 1584, Tom. I, pp. 27-28.

[3] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, vol. 35, (1943), p. 199; The NCWC translation, #13, p. 11.

first kind of definition of the Catholic Church. According to the *De Ecclesia Militante* the Church is "the gathering of those men who are united in the profession of the same Christian faith and in the communication of the same Sacraments under the rule of legitimate pastors, and particularly of the Roman Pontiff, the one Vicar of Christ on earth."[4] The theologians who held that the mere profession of faith would not suffice to keep a man within the Church offered definitions similar to that of Francis Sylvius. He wrote that the Church is "the society of the faithful, ordered and united under one head, Christ, and under His Vicar on earth, the Roman Pontiff."[5] These formulae apply exclusively to the Church militant of the New Testament. They did not become common in scholastic ecclesiology until well into the sixteenth century. In most modern manuals of theology they are called something like "definitions of the Church in the strictest or the most proper sense."

The second type of definition applies to the Church militant since the beginning of the human race, or at least since the time of our first parents. A good example of this type is found in the *De Ecclesiasticis Scripturis et Dogmatibus* of the great Louvain theologian, John Driedo. "The holy Church is the multitude which rejoices in holy unity, a unity understood not according to a gathering in one land or in one province, or in any bodily place, but rather in the union of one sign of faith, of one Spirit giving life in every place and nation, whether they [the members of this multitude] know each other or not."[6] The formula, "congregation," or as some preferred, "convocation of the faithful," employed by the Cardinal John de Turrecremata[7] and Francis Suarez[8] was likewise intended to describe the Church militant as it had existed on earth since the days of our first parents. Suarez' brilliant Jesuit contemporary, Gregory of Valentia, was one of the first to use an equivalent formula as a "narrower" definition of the Church. He taught that the Church on earth since the first days of the human race may be described as "the multitude of men whom the true worship of God and the true but obscure knowledge of faith join together in this life, partly by an internal communication through faith itself, and

[4] *De Ecclesia Militante*, cap. 2, in the Ingolstadt edition of 1586, vol. I, col. 1263.

[5] *Controversiarum Liber III*, q. 1, a. 2; in the *Opera Omnia*, Antwerp, 1698, Tom. V, p. 237.

[6] In the Louvain edition of 1533, p. 503.

[7] Cf. *Summa de Ecclesia*, Venice, 1560, Lib. I, cap. 3, p. 4 recto.

[8] *Opus de Triplici Virtute Theologica, Fide, Spe, et Charitate*, Lyons, 1521. *Tractatus de Fide, Disputatio* IX, *Sectio* I, p. 156.

partly by an external communication in the outward protestation of that faith."[9] This type of definition is the oldest among the scholastic formulae. Early theologians, like Turrecremata and Driedo, preferred to treat of the true Church as an institution which had been in existence since the time of Adam and Eve, and which had reached its perfect status in this world with the advent of its divine Founder.

The third type of definition, that which is most general, is intended to describe the Church as it exists, not only in this world, but in purgatory and in heaven. Gregory of Valentia offers as his "widest" definition of the Church the formula "the multitude of those who through the benefit of divine calling are in some way associated in the true worship of God and in the true and supernaturally acquired knowledge of God, whether that knowledge is in the obscurity of faith or in the clarity and directness of the beatific vision."[10] A more common form of the most general definition was used by Honoratus Tournely. Thus the Church is "the assembly or society of the saints, serving God under one Head, Christ."[11] Tournely and the other orthodox theologians who utilized this formula were careful to point out that the sanctity in the definition involved, as a minimum, only the profession of the holy faith by the members of the Church militant.

The three classes of definitions we have just mentioned do not describe distinct societies. They apply to an organization which exists visibly on earth here and now, but which has its roots in the corporate supernatural life among men before the coming of our Lord, and which has its extension and its ultimate home in the courts of heaven. The first type of definition describes *this society* in such a way as to distinguish it from other social units now existing in this world and claiming the attributes and the prerogatives of the true Church of God. The second type presents it as an organization which is at once the continuance and the perfection of the social body composed of those who believed in the coming of Christ before the Incarnation. The third manifests it as a convocation transcending the boundaries of space and time, a society which extends now into purgatory and into heaven and which is destined to live forever in the light of the beatific vision.

St. Paul, through whom the expression "body of Christ" came into the language of the people of God, applies this designation to the

[9] *Commentariorum Theologicorum Liber Tertius*, Ingolstadt, 1603. Disp. I, Q. 1, Punctum 7, col. 164.

[10] *Loc. cit.*

[11] *Praelectiones Theologicae de Ecclesia Christi, Quas in Scholis Sorbonicis Habuit Honoratus Tournely.* Tom. I, Paris, 1739, q. I, a. 2, p. 22.

visible Church of the New Testament. He writes to the Romans that "*we*, being many, are one *body* in Christ, and every one members one of another. And having different gifts, according to the grace that is given us: either prophecy to be used according to the rule of faith, or ministry in ministering, or he that teacheth in doctrine."[12] St. Paul makes it clear that the group whom he addressed as one body in Christ were those organized with a definite ministry and a definite teaching office. They were the men and women who composed the Catholic Church in the city of Rome. They were the social body whose members could be expected to live "loving one another with the charity of brotherhood."[13]

In the First Epistle to the Corinthians also, the Apostle of the Gentiles leaves no room for doubt about the fact that he applies the term "body" immediately to the visible Church of the New Testament. "For we, being many, are one bread, one *body*, all that partake of one bread."[14] The one bread is of course the Eucharistic food. Those who partake of the one bread, within the visible Catholic Church to whom this Sacrament is entrusted, are the members of this Church. Thus here the designation "one body" is applied immediately to the group described in the definition of St. Robert.

In the same document St. Paul shows that the body of Christ which he describes is an organized society, into which men are initiated through the rite of baptism, a society in which there are diversities of graces, ministries and operations.

> For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body: so also is Christ.
>
> For in one Spirit were we all baptized *into one body*, whether Jews or gentiles, whether bond or free: and in one Spirit we have all been made to drink.
>
> For the body also is not one member, but many.[15]

St. Paul called the Church the body of Christ in order to emphasize, not only the dependence of this society upon the life of our Lord, but also to bring out the mutual dependence of the members among themselves. He uses the analogy of the interdependence of members within a human body and then proceeds to show that those who form a part of the society which he calls the body of Christ are thus organized to

[12] *Rom.* 12: 5–7.
[13] *Rom.* 12: 10.
[14] *I Cor.* 10: 17.
[15] *I Cor.* 12: 12–14.

serve one another. The life of charity is incumbent upon all of those who pertain to the body of Christ, but among these men, some are called upon to exercise the functions of hierarchical ministry. The body is manifestly the society in which this ministry exists by right.

Now *you* are the *body of Christ*, and members of member.

And God indeed hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondly Prophets, thirdly Doctors, after that miracles, then the graces of healings, helps, governments, kinds of tongues, interpretations of speeches.[16]

In the Epistle to the Ephesians, St. Paul speaks of the Church as the body of Christ.

. . . raising him [Christ] up from the dead, and setting him on his right hand in the heavenly places:

Above all principality and power and virtue and dominion, and every name that is named not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.

And he hath subjected all things under his feet: and hath made him head over all the Church,

Which is his body, and the fullness of him who is filled all in all.[17]

St. Paul taught that the organization which he termed the body of Christ was a society which exists in this world, strong in the hope of its divine calling. It is something united and organized here in order to attain, through definite corporate social activity, to a fullness ineffable.

I therefore, a prisoner in the Lord, beseech you that you walk worthy of the vocation in which you are called.

With all humility and mildness, with patience, supporting one another in charity,

Careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

*One body* and one Spirit, as you are called in one hope of your calling.

One Lord, one faith, one baptism.

One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all and in us all.

But to every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the giving of Christ.[18]

[16] *I Cor.* 12: 27–28.

[17] *Eph.* 1: 20–23. The Greek text, and for that matter the critical edition of the Vulgate differ here from the Clementine rendering. Where the Clementine Vulgate has "*supra omnem Ecclesiam*," the Wordsworth and White critical edition reads "*supra omnia Ecclesiae.*" The Greek text "*ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησία*" is best translated "over all things to (or for) the Church."

[18] *Eph.* 4: 1–7.

This grace is given in the visible Church, through the Apostles and the Prophets and the Evangelists:

For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the *body* of Christ:

Until *we* all meet into the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ:

That henceforth we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive.

But doing the truth in charity, we may in all things grow up in him who is the head, even Christ:

From whom *the whole body*, being compacted and fitly joined together, by what every joint supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the *body* unto the edifying of itself in charity.[19]

The Church is called the body of Christ since it is subject to Him, and by reason of the fact that He loves it and has saved it. "The husband is the head of the wife: as Christ is the head of the Church: he is the saviour of his body."[20]

But even here the designation is applied immediately to a society. "Because *we* are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones."[21]

In the Epistle to the Colossians, St. Paul likewise insists that the organization which is designated as the body of Christ is precisely that in which he is a minister. It is the society of which our Lord is the head. "And he is the head of the body, the Church."[22] At the same time it is the society in which St. Paul labors, and for which he suffers, "who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ in my flesh, for his body which is the Church: whereof I am made a minister according to the dispensation of God, which is given me towards you."[23]

The body grows in this world through its salutary contact with the head, "from which the whole body by joints and bands being supplied with nourishment and compacted, groweth unto the increase of God."[24] That body, which is the Church, lives in charity and in peace. "But

[19] *Eph.* 4: 12-16.

[20] *Eph.* 5: 23.

[21] *Eph.* 5: 30. Conversely, the bodies of the members of the Church are said to be the members of Christ. "Know you not that your bodies are the members of Christ?" (I Cor. 6: 15).

[22] *Col.* 1: 18.

[23] *Col.* 1: 24-25.

[24] *Col.* 2: 19.

above all these things have charity, which is the bond of perfection: and let the peace of Christ rejoice in your hearts, wherein also *you are called in one body:* and be ye thankful."[25]

In the light of these texts and definitions it appears that the extension of the Mystical Body of Christ is exactly that of the Catholic Church. The Catholic or universal Church is the proper designation of that holy society described in all three kinds of formulae used as definitions of the Church in scholastic theology. St. Paul has indicated this society, and no other, as the Body of Christ.

Thus, when we say that the visible Church militant of the New Testament, the Roman Catholic Church, is the Mystical Body of Christ, we do not in any sense withdraw that appellation from the glorious assembly of the blessed in heaven or the souls in purgatory. These do not form a society or a Church in any way distinct from the Church militant. The members of the Church on earth are "fellow citizens with the saints, and the domestics of God."[25] The same society which works on earth, under the leadership of Peter's successor, lives in perfect beatitude in heaven. That society is designated as the Mystical Body of Christ.

When we say that the Roman Catholic Church is the Body of Christ we do not imply that the Church exists only in this world any more than we mean that every member of the Army of the United States is in Italy when we say that the American Army captured Salerno. When we designate the Church militant as the Mystical Body of Christ we merely state the fact that this society, alone among all the social organizations in this world, lives a supernatural corporate life which it receives from Christ, and in which the saints in heaven and the souls in purgatory co-operate.

In this world only those who are members of the Catholic Church can properly be designated as actual members of the Mystical Body. The Body of Christ is a society. It is perfectly true that the person who is not a Catholic can have the gift of sanctifying grace. If he has this grace, he has at least the implicit desire of entering the true Church of Jesus Christ as a member, and he receives his grace as a gift from our Lord. But he receives it precisely as one who intends to become a member of the Mystical Body, and not as an actual member of this society. It is at best misguided kindness to describe such a person as a member of Christ.

*Washington, D. C.* JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

[25] *Col.* 3: 15.

## RECENT DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

Continuing his series of dogmatic text-books under the general title *Commentarius in Summam D. Thomae,* the Rev. A. Ferland, S.S., has published the fourth volume, containing the treatises "De Deo Uno" and "De Deo Trino" (Grand Seminaire, Montreal, 1943). This commentary embraces the matter of the first 43 questions of the *Summa,* Part I. The outstanding features of Father Ferland's work are clearness and brevity. While following in substance the order of St. Thomas, he does not hesitate to introduce certain modifications. Thus, immediately after the proofs of God's existence he considers the problem of the intuitive vision of the divine essence by the human mind (which the Angelic Doctor discusses in Q. 12), and only then treats of the divine perfections (the subject of QQ. 3–11 in the *Summa*). Questions of present-day importance, such as the existence of God and the formal constitutive of the divine essence, are discussed in detail, while other matters to which St. Thomas gave considerable attention but which are less important nowadays, such as the Book of Life and the happiness of God, are passed over.

Father Ferland is consistently Thomistic in his choice of opinions. Discussing the desire of the human soul to see God face to face, he admits the possibility of an elicited natural desire, which however can be only inefficacious and conditional. From this he concludes that it is very fitting that God should elevate the created intellect to the supernatural plane; hence, there is a great probability that the human soul possesses the power of being elevated to the beatific vision.

Father Ferland teaches that the future free acts of man are known by God in His predetermining decrees; he rejects the *scientia media.* In conformity with Thomistic principles he holds that predestination to glory is *ante praevisa merita.* Discussing the number of those predestined, he expresses the opinion that, although the majority of men do not attain to eternal salvation, the greater part of the baptized are among the elect. Negative reprobation he regards not as a positive exclusion from glory as from an undeserved benefit (as some Thomists have taught), but as a divine decree permitting that some fail to reach the goal of eternal life.

Father Ferland presents an excellent exposition of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Worthy of special note are his treatment of the

precise constituent of a divine person, his presentation of the various categories of appropriation with reference to the different persons of the Holy Trinity, and the chapter on the divine missions.

The recent Encyclical of the Holy Father on the Mystical Body is the subject of two articles by Dom Theodore Wesseling, O.S.B., in *The Tablet* for Sept. 11 and 18. He summarizes the Encyclical and then essays to point out some of its more important statements. Among others he mentions the definite place of the Holy Ghost in the Mystical Body: "The Holy Ghost is often left out of the vision of the Mystical Body, and *vice versa* the Mystical Body is rarely treated of in books and conferences that speak of the Holy Ghost. But, as the Pope says, the Holy Ghost is none other than the Spirit of Christ, sent by Christ, not teaching anything else but Christ. As such, He is the 'soul', the spiritual, life-giving and life-bearing Principle of the Mystical Body".

In the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for July the Rev. Robert Culhane, C.SS.R., presents an interpretation of the axiom: "Outside the Church no salvation". Father Culhane associates himself with the ever increasing number of theologians who object to the explanation of this axiom in the sense that it suffices for salvation to belong to the soul of the Church, or to possess sanctifying grace. He says: "The phrase: 'For salvation it is sufficient to belong to the soul of the Church alone' is justly objected to as untraditional, inadequate, and to some degree misleading. Let us revert to a terminology which clearly impresses on the minds of all that in the Bride of Christ the union of body and soul is never completely disrupted". Father Culhane gives his interpretation in the form of three propositions—first, to belong to the soul of the Church (to be in sanctifying grace) is for all an indispensable means of salvation; second, to belong to the body of the Church, at least in desire, is for all an indispensable means of salvation; third, to belong actually to the body of the Church in the measure in which they recognize it and are free to enter it is imposed on all as an indispensible means of salvation.

In the same issue of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* the Rev. P. J. Gannon, S.J., writing under the caption "The Sign of Bernadette", scores the unreasonableness and the hypocrisy of those who will not admit, nor even take the trouble to investigate honestly, the miracles that are taking place in the bosom of the Catholic Church, such as those of Lourdes. His condemnation extends not only to professed rationalists but also to some who regard themselves as Christians,

particularly the members of the Commission on Doctrine in the Church of England (headed by the present Archbishop of Canterbury) who announced in 1937: "Some of our colleagues held the view that it is more congruous with the wisdom and the majesty of God that He should never vary the regularities of nature, and find that the grounds for it in their minds are such as constitute a religious motive; and we have readily concurred in recognition of this fact". The same report speaks of "the absence at the present day of miraculous divine intervention, when such intervention might seem morally desirable". Father Gannon comments:

> Does it not excite surprise to find a titular Archbishop of Canterbury co-operating to prevent the recognition of this fact [the miracles of Lourdes] from gaining ground and revivifying faith grown cold? If he and his fellow theological experts just shut their eyes to the whole vast web of wonder woven by divine power within a day's journey of Lambeth Palace, what are we to expect from the godless intelligentsia who have so addled their brains with every kind of witless philosophy and soiled their souls by every sort of moral disorder that they are as helpless as the man at the pool of Bethsaida, with no one, not even their Archbishop, to assist them in when the waters are stirred.

An indication of the drifting away from the basic principles of Christian revelation in the Anglican Church is found in the article "Death and Life" by Bishop Robert of Stepney, appearing in the *Church Quarterly Review*, July–September, 1943. The author argues against the idea of eternal punishment of the wicked, although in putting forth a hope of universal salvation he admits that it conflicts with the general evidence of the New Testament. He believes that the souls of sinners will be separated from God in the next life as long as they remain obdurate. In other words, the sinner will still have a chance to turn to God and thus be admitted to eternal life. "It is legitimate to hope and to believe", he says, "that in the end there will be none who finally and deliberately rebel against the light". The Bishop's explanation of Christ's expression "everlasting fire" is that the fire of punishment will not go out *of itself*—but he leaves to the sinner the possibility of escaping from it by emerging from the state of separation from God. The views expressed in this article exemplify the extreme to which private interpretation of the Scriptures can lead those who have separated themselves from the guidance of the one true Church.

Continuing the series of articles on Eucharistic theology in the

*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Dr. P. Lennon writes in the September issue on "The Fruits of the Mass". By the fruits of the Holy Sacrifice, he points out, are meant those effects that are beneficial to man, as distinct from the adoration and thanksgiving the Mass renders to God. Dr. Lennon makes a threefold division of the fruits—first, fruits of propitiation, which are the graces and helps leading toward the remission of sin; second, fruits of satisfaction, which consist in the remission of temporal punishment; third, fruits of impetration, which are spiritual and temporal favors and graces having no immediate reference to sin. These fruits have received distinct names because they are different in themselves, one from another; but all are produced in the same way, by the moral causality of the Mass. All the fruits could be called fruits of propitiation in the sense that they are conferred because God is placated by the sacrifice; similarly, all could be called fruits of impetration in the sense that they are produced because the Mass impetrates the application of Christ's merits and satisfactions.

From the standpoint of the beneficiaries, Dr. Lennon prefers a fourfold division of the fruits of the Mass—*generalis* (for the whole Church), *specialissimus* (for the priest), *specialis* (for the faithful who assist at the Mass), and *ministerialis* (for the person or persons for whom the Mass is offered in particular). Though some theologians do not admit that any satisfactory fruit is contained in the benefits bestowed on the Church in general, Dr. Lennon believes that all living persons coming under any of these four headings are granted the three fruits of propitiation, satisfaction and impetration. The souls in purgatory, however, can receive only the remission of temporal punishment. This can be accorded to them in two ways—directly, by the immediate application of the satisfactory fruit, and indirectly in that God moves some living persons to apply the satisfactory benefit of their good works to the suffering souls.

The Holy Sacrifice, he continues, benefits no one *qua* sacrifice unless it be in some way offered for him, since the sacrifice is essentially directed to God; then, having adored, thanked and placated Him, it moves Him to assist those to whose benefit it was directed. We may gain these benefits by two titles—*per modum proprii quaestus*, which means that we profit from the Mass because we offer it for ourselves, and *per modum suffragii*, which means that we benefit because the Holy Sacrifice is offered for us by others. The latter title is present in every Mass for each of the faithful, because the Church offers every

Mass for all; the former is present in a greater or less measure in as far as an individual shares in the offering of a particular Mass. Dr. Lennon does not accept Father de la Taille's view that the donor of the stipend as such derives fruit from the Mass *per modum proprii quaestus*, but holds that special fruit comes to the donor *per modum suffragii*, in that the Church through the priest offers the Mass in a special way for him.

In an article entitled "Late Vocations" in *The Month* for May–June, 1943, the Rt. Rev. P. E. Hallett takes occasion to discuss the theological aspect of a vocation to the priesthood. He remarks that in post-war times there is likely to be a scarcity of priests, and Catholic men, some of them of mature years, may be considering entrance into the ranks of the priesthood. Priests should be prepared to advise such prospective candidates as to the precise nature of a priestly vocation. Msgr. Hallett develops the idea proposed by Canon Lahitton a generation ago, and praised by Pope Pius X, to the effect that a vocation on the part of the candidate does not consist necessarily, or even ordinarily, in an internal attraction or in an invitation to enter the priestly state. On the contrary, nothing more is required on the part of the candidate in order that he may be called to orders by the bishop, but a right intention together with fitness. Msgr. Hallett adds: "As when we go to confession with proper dispositions and receive absolution from the priest we know that God has forgiven our sins, so in a somewhat similar way a candidate for the priesthood who has tried to prepare himself well for his holy office, and is moved by a right intention, may, if he receives the call of his bishop be sure that he is called to the priesthood by Almighty God. He need have no anxiety on the score of not being conscious of an inner voice prompting him to seek ordination".

A clear and concise statement on the doctrine of Mary's universal mediatorship, from the pen of Rev. Dr. J. McCarthy, appears in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for November, as a reply to a question. Dr. McCarthy considers the question under three headings—first, is it a defined Catholic doctrine that Mary is mediatress of all graces? Second, is this doctrine true? Third, is it definable? He replies to the first in the negative, to the other two in the affirmative. He summarizes briefly the chief arguments for the doctrine, and points out that it is in no way opposed to St. Paul's statement that there is one Mediator or to the Catholic belief in the immediate efficacy of the sacraments. To the objection that this doctrine may prove a

stumbling block for possible converts Dr. McCarthy replies that an accurate explanation of the doctrine cannot but be a help rather than an obstacle.

*Razón y Fe* for April, 1943, contains an article by the Rev. F. Mateos, S.J., on a mitigated form of Millenarianism that was propounded more than a century ago by a celebrated Chilean Jesuit, Father Manuel de Lacunza y Diaz. Expelled from his native country in 1767, he passed the remainder of his life in Italy, where he died in 1801. His eschatalogical work, *The Coming of the Messias in Glory and Majesty*, written in Spanish, was printed for the first time about ten years after his death. It found a number of defenders. Father Lacunza avoided the carnal interpretation of the Millennium which was in vogue in earlier centuries, and which the Church had condemned. However, he taught that for a time before the final judgment the just will enjoy a happy existence on this earth under the visible headship of Christ, reigning in Jerusalem. Undoubtedly the many trials endured by Father Lacunza had affected his imagination, raising his hopes to this manner of triumph by our Lord. The work attained to considerable popularity, but eventually was condemned by the Holy Office and placed on the Index in 1824. However, in recent times it apparently has found favor with some, especially in South America, so that the Archbishop of Santiago deemed it feasible to consult the Holy See about this type of Millenarianism. The answer, given by the Holy Office, on July 11, 1941, was "tuto doceri non posse".

*La Réincarnation des Ésprits* (Desclée de Brouwer, Rio de Janeiro, 1942), by the Rev. P. Siwek, S.J., gives an account of the various theories that have appeared in the course of the centuries upholding the doctrine of reincarnation. The author points out that such a doctrine is entirely opposed to Christianity, and also demonstrates the weakness of any attempt to establish reincarnation from the standpoint of sound psychology.

An interesting question is discussed in *Les Carnets Viatoriens*, 1942, II, (Joliette, Canada)—whether, in view of the doctrine of the Incarnation one could hold that there are other inhabited planets in the universe. The anonymous writer of the answer admits that some have believed that it would contradict the revealed truth of the Incarnation to hold that there are rational beings dwelling on one of the heavenly bodies, but he himself believes that no such contradiction exists. He cites Ortolan, author of *Études sur la pluralité des*

*mondes habités*, to the effect that there is no article of the Catholic faith, nor decree of Council or Congregation, opposed to the theory that intelligent beings dwell on other planets. In fact, he continues, there are texts in Scripture that seem to support such a theory. For example, the parable of the good shepherd who leaves the ninety-nine sheep to seek the one that was lost, symbolizing the quest of the fallen human race by the Son of God, could lead us to believe that mankind is only a small portion of the body of intelligent creatures. Again, there could be an allusion of the same kind in St. Paul's assertion that God willed through Christ to restore things in heaven as well as those on earth. Certainly, if there were in the universe another race of beings needing a spiritual reestablishment, they could find it adequately in the infinite merits of Christ.

"Theology and the Study of God" by the Rev. Stephen Brown, S.J., in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for November is a plea that priests should try to form for themselves and for their people a concept of the Godhead and of divine perfections that will be an improvement over both the childish notions that people sometimes retain in their devotions and the cold, abstract ideas furnished by theology. "Ought it not be our endeavor to strive on the one hand to bring home to us the living reality that is shadowed forth by the abstractions of our treatises of theology, and on the other to think out the crude notions of God given us in childhood and convince our rational nature of the eternal truths for which they stand?" Father Brown argues that an intelligent person ought to be able to picture God better than as a white-bearded man living in the sky, yet on the other hand one must not have a merely vague and formless concept of the Deity, with no foothold for the imagination and no food for the affections.

The six books *De Sacramentis* found in the older patristic works among the writings of St. Ambrose (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, 16, 417) have been regarded in more recent times as spurious, though many scholars consider them the work of an author of the fourth century. Recently the learned Benedictine, Dom Hugh Connolly, has published two papers under the title *The De Sacramento. A work of St. Ambrose*, (Downside Abbey, England), in which he maintains that there is good reason to acknowledge these writings as the authentic work of St. Ambrose.

*Washington, D. C.* FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

## RECENT SCRIPTURE STUDY

A precious modicum of periodicals continues to brave the Atlantic and to arrive here irregularly but safely; it is also clear from passing comment in these periodicals that American publications are likewise reaching Allied ports. Such magazines as have come to us, however, are devoted less to Scripture than to current topics, philosophy, and theology. Nevertheless here and there are some interesting articles on Scripture, and the following pages will carry information on these.

In the March-April (1943) issue of *The Month*, Father Bernard Leeming writes upon a subject which seemingly has again become a point of some interest at least in England. His article, "The Virgin Birth of Christ" (pp. 127–137), is actually a review of Dr. Douglas Edwards' recent book, *The Virgin Birth in History and Fact*. The article calls attention to the perennial interest in the subject of the Virgin Birth among Protestants, as contrasted with the almost indifferent attitude among Catholics. The reason for the contrast lies in the impression among Protestants that Christianity practically stands or falls on the truth or falsity of the Virgin Birth, whereas among Catholics it is recognized that this doctrine (as Father Leeming notes, p. 128) "is not a truth as abstractly necessary to the defence of the Incarnation as are certain other truths". Another reason for the contrast is to be found in the confused notions among Protestants of the meaning of the Virgin Birth.

For us Our Lady's perpetual virginity involves three things,—virginal Conception, virginal Birth, virginity for all the years following the Birth. Protestants in general usually confine their considerations to the first of the three, the virginal Conception, when discussing the Virgin Birth. In this country, be it said in passing, that even this first notion of Conception is further confused too often with the Immaculate Conception, as the frequent representation of the Immaculate Conception on Christmas cards amply testifies.

Father Leeming's review, in keeping with the book under consideration, is chiefly theological (Dr. Edwards being an Anglican theologian), but from the Scriptural angle, it is interesting to note that the text of John 1: 12–13 is used by the Anglican theologian in substantiation of the Virgin Birth. To do this he has had recourse to the reading of 'was born' favored by Tertullian, Justin, and Irenaeus, instead of the more commonly accepted plural 'were born' of verse 13: "who

were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God". If one reads the singular verb, the text has reference not to the spiritual rebirth of men, but to the corporal, Virginal Birth of Christ. A happy reading, truly, but one which has the almost unanimous witness of the manuscripts against it (only the Verona Old Latin Codex favoring it). Father Leeming's stand is not too clear: he does point out that the Anglican Doctor could have treated the subject more thoroughly by a fuller consideration of the weighty arguments opposed, but he makes an immediate transition to another point in Dr. Edwards' argumentation with the phrase "Not wholly convincing likewise is . . ." (p. 135), which seems to indicate at least a partial conviction of the truth of the variant reading.

On the same subject of Dr. Edwards' preference for the singular verb, Monsignor John M. Barton is not at all convinced. Contributing a note to the May 1943 number of the *Clergy Review*, "The interpretation of John 1: 13", he takes as his point of departure a review of Dr. Edwards' book which appeared in the February 27th 1943 issue of *The Tablet;* in this review the writer is wholly convinced of the correctness of the singular reading. But Monsignor Barton, a very keen exegete, while admitting the attractiveness of the reading as a notable proof-passage in support of the Virgin Birth, prudently rejects it because of the attestation of the manuscripts to the contrary. He is not satisfied, however, with a mere rejection of the reading, but substantiates the plural reading by reference both to the intention of St. John and also to the context of the passage. Proposing and answering the objection that St. John would be more apt to stress the fact that Christ's supernatural, physical Birth was not according to the normal human relations between man and woman than he would be to bring into emphatic relief the idea that man's supernatural, spiritual rebirth was not according to human generation, he points out that the Evangelist was very much concerned to put all possible stress on the spiritual rebirth of the faithful, as seems clear from the First Epistle of St. John.

No contradiction is involved between the two expressions, 'power to become sons of God', and 'who were born . . . of God', since the first expression states the fact, while the second is concerned with the manner of this supernatural birth. And since there is question of a *spiritual* birth, the expression 'not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man' is true to fact, and emphasizes the spirituality of man's rebirth, whereas when applied to Christ's physical Birth, it is hard to avoid redundancy in the expression without giving to the

phrase 'not of blood' a significance which it would be difficult to substantiate from the Scripture.

In the August 1943 number of the same periodical we have an article, "The Kinsfolk of Christ" (pp. 351–356), by A. G. M. (not otherwise identified) which adds a novelty or two to the subject. The writer, confessing himself a 'mere amateur', examines a number of texts in the Gospels, and reaches the conclusion that among the Apostles there are six relatives of Our Lord: John, James the Greater, James the Less, Matthew, Simon, and Jude. In addition, when the lot was cast for the successor to Judas, Joseph on whom the lot did not fall was also probably a relative of Our Lord.

A non-scriptural reference is the first step in the argument: according to Hegesippus, a second-century writer, Cleophas was the brother of St. Joseph, and therefore the brother-in-law of Our Lady. The next step involves a comparison between John 19: 25 on the one side, and of Matthew 27: 55–56 and Mark 15: 40 on the other; all three texts report the women present at the Crucifixion. St. John notes "His Mother, His Mother's sister, Mary of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalen"; St. Matthew: ". . . Mary Magdalen, and Mary the mother of James and Joseph, and the mother of the sons of Zebedee"; St. Mark: ". . . Mary Magdalen, and Mary the mother of James the Less and of Joseph, and Salome". The writer considers that Mary of Cleophas in St. John's account is to be separated from 'His mother's sister'; this being assumed, each Evangelist mentions three women, presumably the same three, since all refer to the same incident. Of the three mentioned, the name of Mary Magdalen is explicit in all three; all three also mention another Mary, St. John according to her husband (Mary of Cleophas), the other two Evangelists in terms of her children (James and Joseph); the third woman is listed in three different ways,—anonymously, as Our Lady's sister, in St. John, with reference to her children in St. Matthew, and by name in St. Mark. From this comparison we have Salome as mother of the sons of Zebedee (John, James the Greater) and also sister of Our Lady; we have also Mary of Cleophas, sister-in-law of St. Joseph and mother of James the Less and Joseph. Hence John and James the Greater are cousins of Our Lord through His Mother's sister, while James the Less and Joseph are His cousins through St. Joseph's brother.

The next step brings Jude, Simon, and Matthew into the same relationship with Our Lord. Jude, first of all, is called by St. Luke (6: 16) 'the brother of James (the Less)', and also by himself in his Epistle (1: 1). Simon is explicitly called the son of Cleophas by

Hegesippus, and is listed both by St. Matthew (13: 55–56) and St. Mark (6: 3) along with James and Joseph and Jude as 'the brethren of Our Lord'. Matthew, finally, is 'Levi, the son of Alpheus' in Mk. 2: 14, the son of the same Alpheus apparently as is mentioned in the phrase 'James of Alpheus' slightly later on (3: 18) without distinguishing comment; but 'Alpheus' and 'Cleophas' are undoubtedly merely different transcriptions of the same Aramaic name 'Halpai' according to linguistic experts. Hence all three, Jude, Simon, and Matthew, being sons of Cleophas, are cousins of Our Lord through St. Joseph. The one cousin not included among the Apostles, Joseph, may well have been the one suggested along with Matthias for successor to Judas, since one of the requirements was that the individual to be selected should have been with Our Lord from the beginning.

The possibility of the writer's evaluation of the texts must be admitted; the probability of that evaluation is something else. For instance, St. Jerome—and with him most modern exegetes—considers 'His Mother's sister' and 'Mary of Cleophas' to be synonymous; if one finds it difficult to imagine two sisters having the same name, as A. G. M. did, there is always the possibility that 'sister' means 'cousin', as at times it does. If St. Jerome's contention be true, then St. John and St. James the Greater drop out of the list of relatives. Again, since Matthew is never mentioned as a relative of Simon or of Jude or of James the Less, it is considered exegetically improbable that the Alpheus who is the father of Levi is the same as the Alpheus who is father of the other three mentioned.

To the April 1943 issue of *Estudios Eclesiasticos*, J. M. Bover contributes a long article on a well-known text of St. Paul. Entitled "Un texto de San Pablo (Gal. 4: 4–5) interpretado por San Ireneo" (pp. 145–182), it considers the Mariological and Christological aspects of the text, first exegetically, then theologically, and finally in the light of St. Irenaeus. Our interest being chiefly exegetical, we shall confine ourselves to that part of the article.

The text is chiastic in form:

> . . . *factum ex muliere,*
> *factum sub lege,*
> *ut eos qui sub lege erant, redimeret,*
> *ut adoptionem filiorum reciperemus.*

The phrases *factum ex muliere* and *ut adoptionem filiorum reciperemus* bear to each other the relationship of means and end; hence the Virginal Filiation[1] of the Son is the means of our adoptive filiation.

[1] 'Virginal Filiation': author's term for the Son's Filiation from Mary.

And since our filiation is as it were a synthesis of the Redemption, it is clear that the Virginal Filiation of the Son (and therefore the Divine Maternity) is an integral element of the Redemption. Thus far exegetes are in agreement. But two questions are posed by the writer: 1) whether, since we participate in the Filiation of the Son—natural in Him, adoptive in us—, we also participate in the Virginal Filiation,—physical in Him, spiritual in us; 2) supposing that we do participate, is the Divine Maternity a purely material element of the Redemption, or is it a formal element? The text makes no explicit affirmation to either question, but the author believes that the text at least suggests an answer.

As a prelude to a very closely reasoned exegesis of the text, Father Bover offers as explanation and excuse—if such be needed—the fact that St. Paul (who characterizes himself as *imperitus sermone* in I Cor. 11: 6) is a master of energetic, suggestive, accurate expression, interested less in rhetoric than in logic. Hence on meeting the very unusual expression *factum ex muliere*, we should seek to discover its fullest force, because of St. Paul's expressiveness; the phrase expresses exactly what he wished to convey. Following on this apology comes a close analysis of the phrase, in the course of which a certain amount of obscurity enters because of the author's appeal to a peculiarly Spanish grammatical terminology. His conclusions are nevertheless clear.

Distinguishing between a 'transitive' and an 'intransitive' meaning of the verb *fieri* (in which the terms have other meanings than when used by English grammarians), he notes that the 'intransitive' meaning (called also 'strong', 'absolute') is 'to be made, produced, formed', while the 'transitive' (or 'weak', 'respective') signifies 'to become'; the first therefore has no predicate, the second has. What the distinction may mean with respect to the phrase *factum ex muliere* will depend on the grammatical status of the prepositional phrase; if the latter is merely a circumstantial complement (of origin or of material), the 'intransitive' sense is imperative; but if it is nominal in sense, then the 'transitive' meaning is demanded. Hence the necessity of clarifying the meaning of *ex muliere*.

We mention immediately that the phrase is interpreted by the writer in a nominal sense, analogous to the *in corruptione* of I Cor. 15: 42-44, where the meaning is surely *corruptibile*. More closely parallel, because the verb *fieri* is involved, are such phrases as *factum est in arborem* (Luke 13: 19), *fiat mensa eorum in laqueum* (Rom. 11: 9), and *factus est primus homo Adam in animam viventem* (I Cor. 15: 45), in all of which the prepositional phrase is equivalent to a noun predicate

of the verb *fieri*. This interpretation, a fact in the examples given, is a possibility in the example under consideration. But since the phrase has reference to Christ, it is the only possibility, since the verb *fieri* is never applied to Him in its 'intransitive' sense, but always in its 'transitive' sense, that is with a predicate to express the term of the action. Whether the predicate be explicitly nominal (as in *Verbum caro factum est*), or a prepositional phrase (as in *factus in agonia*) the sense of the verb must always be 'become', not altogether for grammatical reasons, but certainly for theological reasons, since the Person of the Word can not be the term but only the subject of an action *ad extra*. Hence in such a phrase as *factus ex semine David*, if the prepositional phrase were merely a simple complement instead of a predicate, the Son of God would be both Subject and Formal Term of the Incarnation, and would be conceived as passing from non-being to being,—a heretical concept.

The phrase under consideration, *factum ex muliere*, must therefore be understood as equivalent to *factum filium* (*semen*) *mulieris*, since a predicate rather than a complement is demanded. In the term *mulier* the author is inclined to see a direct reference to the *mulier* (Gen. 3: 15) of the Proto-evangelium. Admitting that it is difficult to prove a connection, he nevertheless offers some suggestions. That a link is not unlikely arises from the fact that *ex muliere* is a very unusual phrase, and is at the same time logically identical with *semen mulieris;* hence an allusion to the Proto-evangelium would be the most satisfactory explanation of so original a phrase. We know also that St. Paul's thoughts were definitely turned toward the opening chapters of Genesis when the second part of Rom. 5 was being written; at about the same time, as is commonly admitted, the Epistle to the Galatians was written, and frequent allusions to Genesis are contained in it.

Turning next to the last phrase of the verse, *ut adoptionem filiorum reciperemus*, two observations are made with respect to *adoptionem filiorum:* 1) that this filiation, fruit and *quasi* synthesis of the Redemption, is contrasted with the previous state of slavery; 2) that in comparison with the Virginal Filiation of the Son, our filiation is a participation of it, even while substantially different because it is adoptive, not natural.

For the term *reciperemus*, the author notes two interpretations, one of St. Augustine, and the other of St. John Chrysostom; for St. Augustine it means the recovery of what had been lost, but for Chrysostom it means the reception of that which had been promised. Modern exegetes prefer Chrysostom's explanation, and the author also prefers it for what he considers a decisive reason. According to him

the whole passage has been conceived in the light of the great antithesis of Law-Promise which the Jews missed so lamentably and which St. Paul stresses so energetically. The Law was a regime of malediction and slavery; the Promise was a regime of benediction which was to culminate in adoptive filiation. In the light of this antithesis, we have the Law in the intermediary phrase *factum sub lege, ut eos . . . redimeret,* and the Promise in the framing phrase *factum ex muliere . . . ut adoptionem filiorum reciperemus.* This antithesis seems to confirm the previous suggestion that St. Paul had in mind the Proto-evangelium, and specifically Gen. 3: 15, when writing it. More reason, then, for suspecting that this unique direct reference to Our Lady in St. Paul, is at the same time a direct allusion to the Woman of Genesis.

With respect to the two questions which the author posed at the beginning, the answer must be brief, since they are treated in the theological section of his article. Basically the idea of solidarity between Christ and the faithful provides the answer. Noting that the two chief ideas of the Law and the Promise in the text have parallel grammatical and logical structures (*factum . . . ut . . .*), the author considers it imperative that the interpretations of these should be analogous, as far as difference of material permits. Hence just as the mere submission to the Law (*factum sub lege*) does not adequately explain the end (*ut . . . redimeret*), but requires and supposes the solidarity of Christ with the faithful whereby He supports the universal malediction of mankind, so likewise the mere fact of His becoming Man (*factum ex muliere*) does not adequately explain the end proposed (*ut adoptionem filiorum reciperemus*) but presupposes a like solidarity. This solidarity, therefore, accepted as inherent in the text, the spiritual Maternity of Mary follows easily from the words *factum ex muliere:* she is Mother of Christ; but we are incorporated in Christ, and She is therefore our Mother. The notion of Co-Redemptrix is less evident, but the author finds it present to some extent in the use of the term *factum* in place of the more obvious *natum* (which would have restricted Mary's activity to Christ directly, instead of widening it to embrace the human race), and from the fact, clear elsewhere in the Scripture, that Mary's cooperation in the *factum ex muliere* was not a material one, but formal, conscious, personal, free. Father Bover's argumentation, much more convincing that the present unsupported summary, is very full, and will repay a careful perusal.

*Woodstock, Maryland* FRANCIS X. PEIRCE, S.J.

# Answers to Questions

## FLOUR FOR ALTAR BREADS

*Question.* Is it true that by government orders some extraneous matter is added to wheaten flour at the present day? If so, what is to be said of the use of altar breads made from such flour?

*Answer.* There are governmental prescriptions, emanating from the office of the Food and Drug Administration, laying down detailed directions concerning the ingredients to be added in the making of certain brands of flour and the proportion in which they may be added. Flour which is modified in this manner is supposed to be labelled (on the container) in such wise that it can be recognized as being a mixture of wheat and of other substances. Thus, we have "enriched flour", "enriched bromated flour", "self-rising flour", "enriched self-rising flour", etc. The substances which are added are mainly vitamins, riboflavin, thiamine, niacin, iron and calcium. The purpose of joining extra ingredients to the wheat is to increase the food-value of the flour.

However, the quantity of these extraneous elements is so small that there is no doubt about the use of bread made from such flours as *valid* matter of the Holy Eucharist. For example, in the making of "enriched flour" the maximum quantity of calcium permitted to a pound is 625 milligrams—about one-seventh of one percent of the whole. The amount of iron, niacin, thiamine, etc., allowed by the Food and Drug Administration is much less. Accordingly, such insignificant additions would certainly not endanger the *validity* of the eucharistic consecration, in the event that the altar breads were made from such enriched flour.

It would not be *lawful* to use such brands of flour for altar breads, when unblended wheaten flour is easily available. Pure flour is still advertised as "white flour", "wheat flour", "plain flour", or simply "flour", and if it is purchased from a reliable firm, those who make altar breads need have no doubts or anxiety about using it. Indeed, even the use of an enriched flour for the making of altar breads would not seem to be *gravely* sinful, since the amount of extraneous matter is so small. Even in what is sold as plain flour there may be, according to governmental regulations, a quarter of one percent of malted barley

flour, to make up for the natural deficiency of enzymes. One of the chemists in the Food and Drug Administration office informed me that in the near future it may become the regular procedure to enrich all wheaten flour placed on the market. In the event that it becomes very difficult to obtain flour that is entirely free from added ingredients, there would be no objection to the use of enriched flour, from the standpoint of theological principles. To such a case can be reasonably applied the words of Cappello, speaking of the mixture of some extraneous element with the wine for the Holy Sacrifice: "Usus vini ita commixti cum alia substantia seu aqua in *minima* quantitate vetatur *sub levi*. Porro, ex certa theologorum doctrina justa et rationabilis causa excusat a peccato veniali" (*De Sacramentis*, I, 289).

An exception must be made, however, in regard to any brand of "self-rising" flour, since bread made from this brand would be leavened, the use of which is gravely sinful in the Latin Church. Furthermore, there is about five percent of extraneous matter in such flour, which might be a seriously illicit amount, even though there would not be much doubt about the validity of its consecration.

## BOMBING OF CIVILIANS

*Question*. Is the direct bombing of the civilian population ever permitted in war, for the purpose of breaking down their morale, so that they may the more speedily sue for peace?

*Answer*. The direct killing of non-combatants, even in a just war, is condemned as sinful by Catholic theologians. Even though the end may be a speedier return of peace—a most desirable objective—the use of this means is not permitted. However, when there is question of applying this principle to the bombing of the residential districts of a city, the solution is by no means simple. For, in the first place, even among the civilians of a belligerent nation today there are many who are directly engaged in war activities, such as the making of weapons and fighting planes, and accordingly they are justly regarded as combatants, even though they are not serving in the armed forces. Secondly, important military objectives are often located in the midst of civilian centres nowadays. To bomb these objectives is lawful, even though it is foreseen that death and injury will thereby be inflicted on civilians, provided that the military advantage thus gained can be justly regarded as proportionate to the harm done to non-combatants. In such a case the killing of the civilians is an indirect and unwilled, though permitted, effect of the attack on the military objectives.

## A PROBLEM IN STERILIZATION

*Question*: In a state in which the civil law prescribes the sterilization of certain classes of the mentally defective may a Catholic doctor, in the service of the state, perform this operation if otherwise he would be dismissed from a lucrative position?

*Answer*: Sterilization of the mentally unfit, such as is described in the question, is intrinsically immoral, a grave violation of the natural law. Hence, a Catholic doctor, whatever inconvenience or loss may come to him in consequence, is obliged to refuse to perform such an operation. A Catholic who would reject Catholic principles to the extent of performing such an operation would not only sin by inflicting on a fellow creature a grave mutilation, but would also (at least ordinarily) be guilty of grave scandal.

## THE PHYSICIAN'S PROFESSIONAL SECRET

*Question*: A physician discovers, in the exercise of his professional duties, that a young man, about to marry, is afflicted with a venereal disease in a virulent form. He tries to persuade the young man to reveal his condition to his fiancée, but without success. May the physician inform the young woman of the danger she will encounter to health and happiness in the event that she contracts marriage?

*Answer*. This question has been the subject of much theological controversy. Aertnys-Damen gives this solution: "Whether it is ever lawful, and even obligatory, for a physician to reveal a secret in order to avert a grave evil from an innocent party, is a matter of controversy among theologians, depending on whether they deem the common good more effectively promoted by silence or by the revelation of the secret. The greater number justify the breaking of the secret; a few demand that it be kept. In practice the manifestation of the secret seems to be lawful, though not of obligation" (*Theologia Moralis*, I, 1250).

In his recent dissertation, *Professional Secrecy in the Light of Moral Principles*, Dr. Robert Regan, O.S.A., gives a more detailed treatment of the question, upholding not only the lawfulness but also the obligation (*per se*) of a manifestation on the part of the physician in a case such as the question supposes. Dr. Regan says: "If the patient still refuses (to make the revelation himself) or if the physician, despite the patient's promise, is not morally certain that the information has been or will be transmitted, then the physician is both permitted and obliged to reveal the facts to the other party, and in some cases (if the

fiancée is too young or otherwise unable to appreciate the gravity of the situation) to the father or mother or guardian of the girl, as the case may warrant. The physician's obligation so to act is a grave one in charity. But the danger of some proportionately serious harm's befalling himself because of the revelation would excuse him from acting in the case. This harm might threaten, for example, from the patient whom he plans to expose" (p. 145).

## BLESSING THE DEACON AT PONTIFICAL MASS

*Question:* It is the custom here, at Pontifical Mass, for the deacon, about to sing the Gospel, to lay the book on the altar, then go direct to the throne to kiss the ring of the Bishop, return to the altar to say the *Munda cor meum*, and then along with the subdeacon and the acolytes etc. go back to the throne, ascend the steps, the subdeacon and the others remaining *in plano*, kneel before the Bishop for his blessing and kiss his ring again, and then go to sing the Gospel. I have been told that it is incorrect to kiss the ring this second time and that the deacon should receive the blessing, kneeling beside the subdeacon on the floor of the sanctuary. Which is the approved practice?

*Answer:* The ring is to be kissed only once, i.e. just after placing the book on the altar and before the *Munda cor meum*. For receiving the blessing, immediately before the Gospel, the deacon kneels *in plano* beside the subdeacon and there is no further salute to the episcopal ring. This accords with the procedure detailed in the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*. (Lib. I, Cap. ix, 2). However, if the Mass is at the faldstool, here again the Bishop's ring is to be kissed only once but in this case after receiving the blessing, just as at a Solemn Mass the deacon kisses the hand of the celebrant after the latter has pronounced the words of blessing. (Martinucci, Lib. VIII, iii, 76, 79). It is true that the *Baltimore Ceremonial* shows some inconsistency in this matter, indicating the kissing of the ring twice in one section (Part V, Chap. VI, Art. III, 9) but making no mention of the repetition of the kiss in another. (Part V, Chap. XIII, Art. III, 8)

## MONSIGNORI IN MUFTI

*Question:* Is it ever permissible for prelates, who wish to assist at a function in inconspicuous fashion, to wear, instead of their prelatial robes, a black cassock, with or without the purple sash, and a surplice, trimmed with a red or violet ribbon?

*Answer:* So far as authoritative sources are concerned, there is no provision for a prelate to assist at a sacred function in any other costume than his choir dress. We know however that in Rome a prelate of high rank sometimes does assist at ceremonies, and even act as officiant, clad in an unornamented black cassock and an unadorned sacerdotal surplice. Should a *Monsignore* here elect to follow this unauthorized, but Roman, custom, we see no reason why the surplice worn should be distinguished by any such frivolous appendage as a red or violet ribbon.

# Analecta

## COMMISSIO PONTIFICIA DE RE BIBLICA

### Responsum

### DE VERSIONIBUS SACRAE SCRIPTURAE IN LINGUAS VERNACULAS

Pontificia Commissio de Re Biblica ad solvendam quaestionem sibi propositam de usu et auctoritate versionum biblicarum in linguas vernaculas, praesertim ex textibus primigeniis, atque ad suum decretum *De usu versionum Sacrae Scripturae in ecclesiis* d. d. 30 aprilis 1934 magis declarandum, sequentes normas referre et commendare opportunum duxit:

Quandoquidem a Leone XIII f. r., Pontifice Maximo, in Litteris encyclicis *Providentissimus Deus* (*Acta Leonis XIII*, vol. 13, p. 342; *Enchiridion Biblicum*, n. 91) commendatum fuit, ut ad penitiorem cognitionem et declarationem uberiorem verbi divini adhibeantur primigenii Bibliorum textus; eaque commendatione, sane non in solum commodum exegetarum et theologorum facta, visum est ac videtur propemodum consultum, ut iidem quoque textus in linguas communiter notas seu vernaculas, utique sub vigili competentis auctoritatis ecclesiasticae cura, iuxta probatas scientiae sacrae adaeque profanae leges vertantur;

quoniam porro ex Vulgata editione, quam unam et solam inter latinas versiones tunc temporis circumlatas Synodus oecumenica Tridentina declaravit authenticam (*Conc. Trid.*, sess. IV, decr. *De editione et usu Ss. Librorum; Ench. Bibl.*, n. 46), desumptae ut plurimum sunt pericopae biblicae in liturgicis Ecclesiae Latinae libris ad sacrosanctum Missae Sacrificium et ad officium divinum publice legendae;

servatis servandis:

1° Versiones Sacrae Scripturae in linguas vernaculas sive ex Vulgata sive ex textibus primigeniis factae, dummodo competentis auctoritatis ecclesiasticae licentia editae sint ad normam can. 1391, a fidelibus pro privata ipsorum pietate rite adhiberi et legi possunt; atque etiam, si qua versio, diligenti tum textus tum adnotationum examine a viris biblica et theologica scientia excellentibus peracto, magis fida et apta inventa sit, hanc Episcopi sive singuli sive in conventibus provinciae

vel nationis suae congregati, fidelibus suae curae commissis peculiariter, si placuerit, commendare possunt.

2° Pericoparum biblicarum in linguam vernaculam versio quam forte sacerdotes s. Missam celebrantes, pro consuetudine vel pro opportunitate, post lectum ipsum textum liturgicum, populo praelecturi sint, iuxta responsum Commissionis Pontificiae de Re Biblica (*Acta Ap Sedis*, 1934, p. 315), textui latino, nempe liturgico, conformis sit oportet, integra manente facultate illam ipsam versionem, si expediat, ope textus originalis vel alterius versionis magis perspicuae apte illustrandi.

Quod responsum Ssmus D. N. Pius Pp. XII, in audientia die 22 Augusti an. 1943 infrascripto Revmo Consultori ab Actis benigne concessa, ratum habuit et publici iuris fieri mandavit.

Romae, 22 Augusti 1943.

IACOBUS M. VOSTÉ, *Consultor ab Actis.*

## SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

### I

In the cause for the beatification and the canonization of the Venerable Servant of God, Mary Teresa of Jesus, in the world Alexia Le Clerc, Foundress of the Canonesses Regular of St. Augustine of the Congregation of Notre Dame, after consulting the Congregation, the Holy Father declared that three cures wrought through the intercession of the Servant of God were manifestly instantaneous and perfect. The beneficiaries of these cures were:

1) Sister Mary of St. Aloysius, a Canoness Regular of St. Augustine of the Congregation of Notre Dame, who suffered from a malignant tumor of the abdomen.

2) Sister Mary Cecelia, a religious of the same Congregation, who suffered from Pott's disease or tuberculous spondylitis.

3) Sister Eleanor Le Clerc, a Visitation Nun, who was afflicted with impetiginous ecxema of the head and ears which competent physicians declared to be relatively incurable.

The Holy Father's decision was given March 21, 1943.

### II

On April 9, 1943, the Holy Father assigned a Commission to take up the cause of canonization of the Blessed Philippine Duchesne, of the Society of the Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

# Book Reviews

THE CAPTAIN WEARS A CROSS. By William A. Maguire, Captain (Ch C), U. S. N. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1943. Pp. xiii + 207. $2.00.

Father Maguire's first book, *Rig for Church*, closed with a brief account of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. In *The Captain Wears a Cross* he takes up again his story of a naval chaplain's life. After relating in greater detail the events of that dark December seventh, he describes the days which followed, when the high courage of the wounded, the devotion of those on whom their care devolved, and the grim determination with which the United States forces rallied from the blow shone through the shadows of confusion, suffering and death. The rest of the book is concerned with Father Maguire's crowded months of labor for God and country after the declaration of war.

*The Captain Wears a Cross*, however, is not in any sense a diary of Father Maguire's life since Pearl Harbor. It is a leisurely, discursive, familiar book, replete with anecdote and reminiscences of the author's early years as a chaplain. It is the work of a born story-teller, with a sincere liking for people in general, and the highest respect and admiration for the Navy men to whom he has ministered for more than a quarter of a century. There is, incidentally, a story in the first chapter which illustrates the value, to the morale of men in battle, of the presence of a priest. During the Pearl Harbor attack, Father Maguire heard the confession of one of the seamen manning the guns. "After giving the young fellow absolution," the author writes, "he thanked me and there was a smile on his Irish face. Then with a gleam in his blue eyes, he spat on his hands and exclaimed, 'Now bring on them blasted Japs!' "(p. 8).

Modest and unassuming as Father Maguire is with regard to his own work, this volume will be to all Catholics a source not only of legitimate pride in the accomplishments of the priests who serve as chaplains in the armed forces but of a deeper understanding of the spirit of the chaplaincy, and of the dignity and necessity of the chaplain's ministry. Those who enjoyed Captain Maguire's first book will find renewed pleasure in reading its sequel. *Rig for Church* was a fine book; *The Captain Wears a Cross* is, we think, an even better one.

E. D. BENARD

THEOLOGIA NATURALIS. By Rafael Martínez del Campo, S.J. (Part 6 of the Ysleta College *Cursus Philosophicus*). Mexico City, Buena Prensa, 1943. Pp. xxvii + 430. $2.00.

A good-neighbor partnership of more than commercial or political significance has issued in this product of Latin-American scholarship on Texas soil. It is the second volume to appear in the series of philosophy textbooks undertaken by the Mexican Jesuits in their house of studies at Ysleta. The American clergy may well be proud to see edited in their midst a series marked by such excellence as the *Critica* and the *Theologia Naturalis* display.

Doctrine and mode of presentation alike merit high commendation from the reviewer of the present volume. Father Martínez del Campo evidences a remarkable speculative acumen combined with extensive erudition and a large-minded fairness of judgment. His criticism of divergent opinions, while not sparing a forthright statement of the truth, yet acknowledges generously the real merits of opposing schools of thought.

This book serves a threefold purpose. As a textbook it sets forth the elementary problems. As a recapitulation of metaphysics it resumes in the light of the highest truth of the divinity many questions treated in other branches. As a comparative study it laudably endeavors to reconcile the varying formulations of philosophical principle, thought out by the leading representatives of the great classical schools.

The author, while remaining faithful to the teaching of the Angelic Doctor, emphasizes in due proportion the contribution of Scotus and Suarez at a later period. By this insistence on the merit of reasons over personalities he proves his conformity to the mind of the Church and the constant policy of Saint Thomas himself.

The threefold Table of Contents suggests the purposes of the book. In its textbook-function it follows the thesis-presentation, using fine print to set off what is beyond the scope of ordinary classroom investigation. The Table of Asserta and the Table of Scholia give a brief survey of what in the mind of the reviewer constitutes the chief merit of the book. Problems evaded in similar texts are here treated in a masterful way An example is the comparison of divine and created causality in Assertum 20; but every one of the 24 asserta is equally deserving of praise. The scholion on *peccatum philosophicum* is a thoroughly convincing explanation, the best we have yet seen.

While praising the just merits of the volume, the reviewer desires to note one point on which he cannot agree with the author. It concerns the knowledge of the futuribles. Arguments intended to show that they can be known not merely in the divine essence but also immediately in themselves were not quite convincing.

For a new edition it is desirable that the now too considerable list of printing mistakes, especially those connected with foreign names, be reduced; and that certain Latin expressions, whose brevity and compression might give rise to misunderstanding, be improved.

JOSEPH L. SPAETH, S.J.

FROM JESUS TO PAUL. By Joseph Klausner, Ph.D., translated from the Hebrew by William F. Stinespring, Ph.D. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1943. Pp. xvi + 624. $3.50.

This book is a sequel to *Jesus of Nazareth*, published some years ago and subsequently translated into English. In that work the author attempted to prove that Jesus was nothing more than a good Jew, although neither faultless nor infallible, who did not have the remotest intention of establishing a universal and perpetually enduring Church. In the present work Dr. Klausner attempts to prove that the Church and Christianity have as their founder Paul of Tarsus, a visionary, a victim of hallucination, impregnated with the doctrines and practices of the pagan mystery religions. Combining pagan notions and his own hallucinations Paul formed the "so-called" Christian religion along lines which he knew would appeal to and attract converts from paganism. In his preaching of this new doctrine Paul encountered bitter opposition from Peter and James and from the Jews generally, but he emerged victorious not only because he had a splendid gift of adaptation, shaping the new religion in such a way as to appeal to the mystic yearnings and religious ideas of the contemporary pagan world, but also because at this time the Jews, the only source of effective opposition, were too busily occupied with their own internal struggles which eventuated in the destruction of Jerusalem and almost of the nation in 70 A. D. to concern themselves seriously with counteracting the new movement.

How does Dr. Klausner arrive at these conclusions? Mainly by utterly rejecting the historical reliability of the Acts of the Apostles, and by seeing in those Pauline Epistles which he admits as genuine merely a reflection of the Apostle's subjective views. These rest not on a real, historic Christ who actually arose from the dead, but on the imaginary visions of an hallucinated Paul. When, however, an incident recorded in the Acts or the Pauline Epistles seems to corroborate the author's views even in the slightest degree relative to his supposed life-long and bitter struggle between Paul and the other Apostles, he takes it and twists its implications. This is his method of procedure with the incident of Antioch, and the meeting of the Church at Jerusalem as recorded in Acts 15.

It should be remarked too that Dr. Klausner is evidently a devoted and admiring student of the German rationalists of the last hundred years and more, and in this book he disinters long buried theories which we had hoped would be allowed to rest in peace in the graveyard of long-forgotten and oft-refuted systems.

JOSEPH L. LILLY, C.M.

THE LEONARD FEENEY OMNIBUS. A Collection of Prose and Verse Old and New. New York, Sheed and Ward, 1943. Pp. xiv + 399. $3.00.

Most of the material in this Omnibus has been printed before. Yet the

publishers have done the cause of American letters a considerable service in bringing out this collection. Certainly the years to come will see more extensive editions of Father Feeney's works. We are fortunate in having this much now. This Omnibus, small though it is, is far more effective than little books and scattered articles in bringing us to appreciate the foremost man of letters in Catholic America.

His trained and gifted mind has caught what is best in our own life scene. The Omnibus shows us Catholic loyalty in a barber shop, the theological virtues on the Boston and Albany, apologetics on the New York, New Haven and Hartford, and God's charity in Lynn and Paris. The things he saw are the things we all might have seen, and which we know better because he has seen them.

Father Feeney as an author we reverence and acclaim. However we are considerably less enthusiastic about his prowess as an editor. It is difficult in the extreme to pardon a man who left "*The Brown Derby*" out of a Leonard Feeney Omnibus.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON.

GOD'S GUESTS OF TOMORROW. By Rev. L. M. Dooley, S.V.D. Sea Isle City, N. J., Scapular Press, 1943. Pp. 105. $1.75.

The author of *God's Guests of Tomorrow* makes what he calls a "mystical trip" to Purgatory for the purpose of presenting to the reader an idea of Purgatory, giving special consideration to the pain of separation from God, to the intensity and duration of the sufferings of the poor souls, and to the ways in which the living can aid them, namely, by prayer, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and Indulgences.

The nine chapters were originally preached as sermons; herein lies the reason for the warmth and persuasiveness which pervade the pages of this small book. In presenting points of doctrine the author follows the easier and safer course of bringing in copious quotations, which are usually striking and illuminating.

It would be well to keep in mind that not all the sources quoted have equal authority and that the many speculations of the time concerning purgatory gave rise to the admonition of the Council of Trent, *sess. 25, Decr. de Purg.* (DBV 983), that sound doctrine contained in the *Fathers and Councils* should be preached,—that more difficult and subtle questions, which do not contribute to the edification of the faithful should be avoided, that uncertain things should not be taught, etc. The grossly truncated sentence on p. 82, l. 3, mars the typographical success of the book. The title words, "God's Guests", are not fortunate from a theological standpoint, for a soul that attains heaven is more than a guest—it is in its Father's house by the title of grace.

S. J. GRABOWSKI.

DISCOVERING MEXICO. By Rev. John A. O'Brien. Huntington, Indiana, Our Sunday Visitor Press, 1943. Pp. 151. Cloth $1.25. Paper $0.60.

This little book may well serve as an introduction to Mexico, both for prospective visitors to that country and to those who, as the author says, do their "vagabonding by the more comfortable arm-chair method." A collection of short informal sketches, it brings together some history of Mexico and certain of its current problems, with some of the author's personal experiences on and off the beaten path of tourists.

Thoroughly sympathetic with the Mexican people and Catholic in all its indications, the book gives glimpses of Catholic Action, Synarchism, and the current status of the Church. Hardly aspiring to be a distinguished addition to the literature on the subject, it nevertheless serves a valuable purpose in a field largely preempted by forces which have ignored, belittled, or attacked the Catholic culture of the country. Questions for discussion are listed for each chapter. The addition of a short bibliography would have increased the value of the book for readers who might like to advance a bit farther in their knowledge of Mexico.

JAMES A. MAGNER.

DEMOCRACY: SHOULD IT SURVIVE? A Symposium Issued by the William J. Kerby Foundation. Milwaukee, The Bruce Publishing Co., 1943. Pp. 159. $2.00.

This eminently authoritative portrayal of the principle underlying American Democracy is the first contribution of the William J. Kerby Foundation recently established at the Catholic University of America. The late Monsignor Kerby, "Father of the American Catholic Charities," left in his writings the words which constitute the focal theme of this symposium: "Democracy is primarily social, moral, and spiritual: it is secondarily political."

The occasion for this presentation is the fact that shallow-thinking Americans have come to regard Democracy as they regard Totalitarianism, i.e., simply as one among several forms of modern government.

*Democracy: Should it Survive* aims to correct this all too prevalent myopia by piercing Democracy's outer layer, and focusing the attention of the reader upon its essence. Here man is confronted not with a form of government, but rather with a philosophy of life.

The essence of Democracy is identified with the primacy of human rights, and the dignity proper to the individual human personality. These basic ideas are explained, justified and guaranteed in the cognate Catholic Dogmas of the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of man, the supreme value of the human soul, man's nature, origin, and destiny. From the Divine as from the human aspect, therefore, Democracy is preeminently "personalistic."

Its beginnings are rooted, not in the strivings of human wit and enterprise, but rather in the Heart of God, to be enshrined forever in the matchless life and teachings of Jesus Christ. The individual human personality, therefore, has been clothed by God Himself with a sacredness which becomes law to men and human institutions.

The several contributors to this symposium, all of whom with one exception are Catholic, have applied this basic concept of Democracy to the warp and woof of American life. Where our American institutions have succeeded, this concept has been operative: where they have failed, it has been ignored. The measure of its application has been the measure of our progress in solving the complex problems of our national life.

In the foreword, Thomas F. Woodlock states that in these days man must be regarded either as the "*highest animal*, coming from he knows not where, going he knows not where, a single being in a herd whose laws he must obey, for whose benefit he exists; or as a *person*, unique in kind, apart from and above all else in the visible universe, coming from God and destined to return to God where he shall find his end, his peace and his happiness. . . .The world now faces a tremendous *either—or*, which will determine its fate for centuries to come."

This central theme is excellently developed by Monsignor John A. Ryan, Richard J. Purcell, Luigi Sturzo, Walter Lippmann, Karl F. Herzfeld, David A. McCabe, Philip Murray, Raymond H. Reiss, Louis T. Achille, Lois and J. J. Curry, Jane M. Hoey, Jacques Maritain, and William H. Russell.

The Catholic priest or layman who takes up this excellent volume cannot but realize that Catholicism and Democracy are more closely knit together than he had ever dared to dream.

EDWARD DOWD.

# Book Notes

In *One Hundred Years of Probation, Part Two* (*Fordham University Studies*, New York, Fordham University Press, 1943. Pp. vii + 69) Dr. Timasheff deals with the development of probation in continental Europe, Latin America, and parts of Asia and Africa. He describes the development and decline of the Franco-Belgian and German systems, and the progress of the "combined form." A chapter is devoted to the development of probation between the two world wars, with outlines of the systems carried out in the democracies, the Soviet Union and the Fascist dictatorships.

Because they are called upon so often to cooperate in the administration of probation, priests in parish work will find Dr. Timasheff's study interesting and instructive. Together with Part I, published two years ago, which confined its treatment to the English speaking nations, it provides an excellent outline of the history of probation.

The papers which make up *New Goals for Old Age* (Edited by George Lawton. New York, Columbia University Press, 1943. Pp. xi + 210) were originally prepared for a course, "Mental Health in Old Age" conducted under the auspices of the Welfare Council of New York City in 1940–1941. The purpose is to set down some of the more recent ideas concerning the nature and needs of older people. The fifteen chapters are by persons actually engaged in medical and social work for the aged.

The articles are rather short and do not go into their subjects very thoroughly. The longest, and probably the best, are the two by Dr. Lawton, "Aging Mental Abilities and Their Preservation" and "Old Age, First Personal Singular." Although there are chapters on work therapy, occupational therapy, the creative urge in older people, and bibliotherapy, there is no mention of the value of religion. Of course, religion is not one of the "more recent ideas." Only the anonymous author of "How It Feels to be Seventy-five and a Woman" gets above the natural. She confesses she believes "intensely in a Great Plan toward the development of the spirituality of the human race, recognizing the infinitely slow progress toward this desired and essential accomplishment." It is doubtful that a priest will find anything helpful or that he does not know in this volume.

*American Freethought, 1860–1914*, by Sidney Walker, Ph.D. (New York, Columbia University Press, 1943. Pp. 257) is a thoughtful, rather sympathetic study of the rise and decline of the freethought movement in this country in the years following the war between the states. The author tells how the freethinkers seized upon the theories of Darwin and Huxley to bolster their attacks on the Bible, theology and the existence of God. The heated debates on the platform and in the press are described, but particular stress is laid on the political and social theories, the literature and the outstanding personalities of the freethought movement. Dr. Walker points out that the United

States was one of the most secular nations in the world, which explains, in part, the weakness of the secularist movement. Most Americans took the question of separation of Church and State for granted, and were more concerned with economic and political problems. While Dr. Walker seems to be sympathetic with the freethinker cause, he makes a real effort to be objective and his dissertation will be read with interest by those interested in American ecclesiastical history.

*The Single Woman*, by Ruth Reed, Ph.D. (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1942. Pp. xiv + 227) is a descriptive and analytical study of the place and function of the single woman in our contemporary society. It is based upon the findings of previous studies and the author's study of 300 single women employed in business and professional pursuits.

In securing information, the author employed the personal interview, the usual method employed by social scientists in studies relating to personal and social adjustments. Dr. Reed endeavored to obtain from the individual woman her concept of her place and role in society; her understanding of the personal and social factors which had influenced her toward the single life; and the problems of adjustment which confront her in her efforts to function as a useful and effective member of society. Obviously to secure such information requires skill and finesse and the establishment of a relationship of confidence and ease under the circumstances must have been difficult. Nevertheless, Dr. Reed seems to have been successful, and to have followed a flexible and sensitive approach which brought good results.

This is not the dry dissertation nor the smirking case book that make up so much of social work literature. It is thoughtful, considered, and gives a real insight into the problems and position of the single woman. The problem of the single woman is a puzzling one for many pastors and priests in city parishes. We suggest that they read Dr. Reed's sane little book.

*A Handy Guide for Writers*, by Rev. Newton Thompson, S.T.D., (St. Louis, Mo., B. Herder Book Co., 1943. $2.00) will be a useful addition to the library of all those who write (or aspire to write) for publication. In the brief space of 248 pages it gives an alphabetical list of words frequently used incorrectly or inexactly, rules for punctuation, hyphenation, capitalization, etc. It should be most helpful in the preparation of copy for the printer, and in the correction of the proofs.

The Newman Bookshop of Westminster, Maryland, has recently brought out two more valuable reprints, *The Text of the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius*, (Pp. ix + 125. $1.25), and *The Spiritual Conferences* of St. Francis de Sales, (Pp. lxxi + 406. $2.75). The former contains a preface by the famous English Jesuit Father John Morris, long famous as a master of novices. While less imposing than Rickaby's edition of the *Exercises*, it is one of the most valuable editions for the ordinary reader. The Conferences, the text of which was taken down by the Visitation Nuns of Annecy who listened to the Saint, were translated into English for this edition under the direction of Cardinal Gasquet and Dom Mackey. This edition carries valuable introductory essays by these two writers, and another by Cardinal Wiseman.